

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. I.

No. 2.

I. ETYMOLOGICAL AND GRAMMATICAL NOTES.

1.—*Τηλουρός*.

Τηλουρός occurs twice in Aeschylus' Prometheus, and twice in Euripides, besides once in Apollonius Rhodius.¹ Its actual meaning is simply 'far,' 'remote': εἰς τηλουρόν ἵκομεν πέδον, 'into a distant land' (Prom. 1); τηλουρόν δὲ γῆν ἥξεις, 'thou shalt come to a far country' (809); τηλουρά γὰρ ναίουσ' ἀφ' ἡμῶν πεδία, 'though she dwells in plains distant from us' (Andr. 890); τηλουρός οὔσα δωμάτων, 'while I was far from the palace' (Orest. 1325); this last is the only passage which does not imply a very great distance. The current etymology of the word is 'far-bounded,' 'having distant boundaries.' Hesychius, τηλουρόν· πόρρω ἀφωρισμένην; Etymol. Magn., τηλουρός· ὁ πόρρω ἀπὸν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τηλοῦ καὶ ὄρος; and so modern dictionary-makers, including W. Dindorf (Lexicon Aeschyleum).

The accent of the word is against this. Compounds of this sort, ending in -ος, accent the ultima or a short penult only when the latter part of the compound has an active sense, as doer or agent: so λιθο-βόλος, 'stone-thrower,' distinguished from λιθό-βυλος, 'pelted with stones'; νεο-τόχος, 'having lately brought forth,' but νεό-τοκος, 'new born.' And possessive compounds in -ος are always, or almost always, accented recessively. Our word, therefore, if really a compound of ὄρος (οὄρος), 'boundary,' ought

¹ Argonautica 2, 544: οὐ δὲ τις αἶα τηλουρός.

to be *τήλουρος*, or at least *τηλοῦρος*.¹ Lycophron, indeed, uses *ἀγχοῦρος*, and its accent as properispomenon is expressly attested by Herodian. And *τηλοῦρος* has been written, it would seem, even in ancient times; for the Hesychian gloss above quoted goes on, *τινὲς μὲν ὡς πανοῦργον, τινὲς δὲ ὡς κηπουρὸν τῷ τόνῳ*, and then comes a second gloss, *τηλοῦρος· μακρόθεν ἀποθείς*. Of modern scholars Reisig wished to write *τηλοῦρος*. But the testimony of Herodian must be considered final as to the accent. He cites it as oxytone, along with *οἰκουρός* and *κηπουρός*.² This fact makes very strongly against the etymology in question, especially as the supposed idea of 'boundaries' by no means necessarily lies in the word. I can think of only one way in which a deviation like this from the normal accentuation could be accounted for. Supposing that all, or nearly all other words in *-ουρος* were oxytone, this one word standing by itself might, we can conceive, be drawn into the analogy of the rest. We shall have, I think, to conclude that this has happened in the case of some words in *-ωπος* to be hereafter discussed. But even that resource seems to fail us here. For although there are four or five other oxytones in *-ουρός*, there are, on the other hand, *πρόουρος* (Soph.), *ἄπουρος* (Soph.), *δμουρος* (Hdt.), to say nothing of the late *ἀγχοῦρος*,³ and of *σείουρος*, *χέρουρος*, *ἀρχτοῦρος*, and others. These would have protected a **τηλοῦρος* or **τήλουρος* from any influence of false analogy.

Hartung regarded *τηλουρός* as a derivative merely, not a compound, and in this he is followed by Wecklein. According to them⁴ it is formed from *τηλοῦ* as *τολμηρός* from *τόλμη*, and *πονηρός* from *πόνος*. This is by no means convincing. For *τηλοῦ* is genitive of an obsolescent noun-stem *τηλο-*, whence *τηλό-θεν*, *τηλό-θι*, *τηλοῖ*, *τηλο-τέρω*, *τηλο-τάτω*. And what is a derivative suffix doing behind a genitive case? Suffixes should be added to stems, not cases. To the grammar of the last generation there was, of course, nothing strange in the idea of an adjective derived from an adverb,

¹ The oldest (inscriptional) form of *δρος*, 'boundary,' is *δρφος*. Its etymology is unknown. As no initial consonant can be proved for it, it seems that we should have to suppose **τήλ-ορφος*, proparoxytone, to start with; then **τήλ-ουρος* (cp. *ἀπ-ουρος*, *δμ-ουρος*); so that the accentuation *τηλοῦρος*, *ἀγχοῦρος*, remains after all unexplained.

² Lenz I, p. 202, 17.

³ *τετρωρος* in the Heracleian Tables, C. I. G. 5764, 5775, is also a compound of *δρος*, but of course there is no tradition about its accent.

⁴ On Prom. I.

and our dictionaries are full of such derivations yet. But I do not know of a single clear case of the sort. Adverbs are *fossilized* cases, so to speak, of dead (or living) nouns. And where derivatives exist, they are formed, as they should be, from the stems of these nouns. An instance or two will illustrate my meaning. *Μάταιος*, any one can see, is not from *μάτην*, but from the stem *ματα-* of the old noun *μάτη*, which is still rarely used. But just so *ἄνταϊος* is not from the adverb *ἄντα*, as such, but from the stem *ἄντα-*, which survives in *ἄντην*, and would appear, as a noun, to be not quite extinct. And *κρυφαῖος*, *ἡρεμαῖος*, *λαθραῖος* are likewise to be understood, not as from *κρύφα*, *ἡρέμα*, *λάθρα* outright, but as from dead stems *κρυφα-*, *ἡρεμα-*, *λαθρα-*. The relation of *αἰψηρός* to *αἰψα* is probably not different. The adverb *χαμαί* makes no adjective, but its stem *χαμα-* (also in *χαμᾶ-θεν*, *χαμᾶ-δεις*, *χαμᾶ-ζε*) makes *χαμηλός*. And—passing to adverbs like *τηλοῦ*—*δμοῦ* and *ὕψοῦ* can form no derivatives, but their stems *όμο-* and *ὕψο-* (compare *ὕψό-θεν*, *ὕψό-θι*, *ὕψοι*, *ὕψό-σε*, *ὕψο-τάτω*) give rise to *όμοϊος* and *ὕψηλός*. Now just so, if an adjective corresponding to *τηλοῦ* had been wanted, it would have been formed from the stem *τηλο-*; and if formed in *-ρός* it could have been nothing else than **τηληρός*, as *πονηρός* from *πονο-*, *νοσηρός* from *νοσο-*, and more than forty others.

I think it probable that *τηλουρός* is a compound, not of *ὅρος*, 'boundary,' but of *ὅρος*, *ὀδρος*, in compounds also *-ωρος*—originally *φόρος*—'watcher,' 'looker,' and is formed exactly like *οἰκουρός*, 'house-guardian,' and *κηπουρός*, 'garden-watcher,' the words along with which Herodian cites it; to which may be added *ἐκφυρός* (late), 'fence-watcher'; also *πυλωρός*, *πυλα-ωρός* (*πυλα-φόρος*), 'gate-keeper,' and *θυρωρός*, *ἀρχυρωρός*, *σχευωρός*, *φρυκτωρός*, as well as *τιμωρός*, *τιμά-ορος* (*τιμα-φόρος*) 'honor-guardian,' 'avenger.'¹ Accordingly, **τηλε-φόρος* (or **τηλο-φόρος*), meaning primarily 'watching from afar,' and so 'looming up in the distance,' and applied first, let us imagine, to a tree or mountain on the distant horizon; then by use the meaning might fade, perhaps, into 'seen in the distance,' and then merely 'distant.' An inkling of this etymology may have lurked in the mind of a scholiast on Prom. 1, who defines the word, *ἀφ' οὗ τῆλε καὶ μακρὰν ὁρᾶν τις δύναται*,

¹ All these words must have shifted the accent to the ultima after contraction, in order to conform to the rule which prescribes that compounds of this class shall be oxytone if they have a long penult. At the outset **πυλα-φόρος*, etc. (like *σκενο-φόρος*), must be assumed. The accent of *τιμά-ορος* is to me inexplicable.

that is, 'affording a distant view,' which is certainly a wrong turn, at least for the passage in question, but shows perhaps some notion of the original meaning.

If this transition of meaning seems harsh, it may be observed that we have a close parallel in the Sophoclean *τηλωπός*. It means, as used, simply 'far'; *τηλωπός οἰχνεῖ*, 'he is gone far away' (Ai. 564); *βοᾷ τηλωπὸν ἰωάν*, 'he utters a shout from afar,' or 'penetrating far.' The original meaning must have been, not 'seen from afar' (Liddell and Scott), 'e longinquo conspicuus' (Dindorf), '*μακρόθεν φαινόμενον*' (Hesychius), but rather 'far-seeing,' 'fern schauend' (Pape), like *σκυθρωπός*, 'gloomy-looking,' and plenty more. But 'far looking' can pass without much trouble into 'far visible'; for whatever looms up so as to see us, that we can see in turn; and, finally, can come to mean simply 'far,' without reference to vision.

These adjectives in *-ωπός* demand a word in passing. Most of them are generally taken as containing *ὤψ*, 'face,' 'eye.' But their accent again is not what we look for in possessive compounds, and suggests rather an active verbal *-ωπό-ς*, 'looking.' Now, a good many of the words in question admit this explanation just as easily as the other, and some seem to require it. *Τηλωπός* seems a clear case of this, for 'far-eyed' or 'far-faced' would not give much sense. So too:

πυρωπός: *κεραυνός* (Prom. 667), 'fiery-looking,' 'fire-glancing' lightning, better than 'fire-eyed.'

φλογωπὸν πῦρ (Prom. 253), 'flame-looking,' 'flaming.'

ἀντωπός: *ἀντωποῖς βλεφάροισι* (Iph. A. 584), 'eyes that looked him face to face.'

γοργωπός: *γοργωπὸν σέλας* (ἐξ ὀμμάτων, Prom. 356), 'fierce-glaring' flame; *γοργωποὺς κόρας* (H. F. 868), 'fierce-flashing' eyes; better than 'fierce-visaged.' So:

ἄγριωπὸν ὄμμα (H. F. 990), 'wild-looking.'

φαιδρωπὸν ὄμμα (Orest. 894), 'cheerful-looking.'

σκυθρωπὸν ὄμμα (Phoen. 1333), 'gloomy-looking.'

ἀστερωπὸν ὄμμα *Λητώας κόρης* (Aesch. Fr. 164 N.), 'star looking,' 'star-like.' But *ἀστερωπὸς αἰθήρ* (Ion. 1080), 'starry' firmament.

αἱματωποὺς κόρας (Orest. 256), 'bloody-looking,' 'blood-shot' eyes (*αἷμα βλεπούσας*, Hesych.). In *αἱματωποὶ δεργμάτων διαφθοραὶ* (Phoen. 870, of Oedipus) it does not necessarily mean 'bloody-eyed'; we can translate 'the bloody mutilation of his eyes.'

In these cases the supposed active meaning seems to me preferable. Observe that in the last two ('starry,' 'bloody') the meaning has begun to fade out much as in *τηλωπός*. This fading has gone further in:

χοιλωπός ἀγμός (Iph. T. 263), 'hollow-looking,' and so practically 'hollow'; and

νυκτερωπός: *δόχημα νυκτερωπὸν ἐννύχων ὀνείρων* (Herc. F. 111), merely a 'nocturnal' vision. Perhaps also in *στεινωπός* (Homer), 'narrow-looking,' and so 'narrow'; to which Euripides has the counterpart in *χάσμα ἐδρωπὸν πέτρας* (Iph. T. 626), a 'wide' crevice. However, a different understanding of these two is possible.

Others are less decisive so far as meaning goes: *δεινωπός* (Hes. Scut. 250, of the *Κῆρες*), *τερατωπός* (Hymn. Hom. 19, 36, of Pan), *μωπός*, *οἰνωπός*, *μαρμαρωπός*, *μορμωρωπός*, *εἰσωπός*. Yet their accent affords a presumption in favor of the active sense.

On the other hand, one or two resist this interpretation. For even if we can understand *παρθενωπός* (Eur. Elec. 948) as 'girlish-looking' rather than 'girl-faced,' and *ἀμβλωπός* (*θαυρύων βίον ἀμβλωπὸν*, Eum. 955) as 'dim-looking' rather than 'dim-eyed,' still the *μυριωπός βοῦτας* (Argos) of Prom. 569 cannot be other than 'many-eyed.' Not less certainly have we a possessive compound in *δικτύῳ πολυωπῷ* (Od. γ 386), which seems to contain an **ὠπή* 'hole,' equivalent to *ὀπή*. And it is possible to take *στεινωπός* and *ἐδρωπός* in a similar way, as Vaniček does, though to me this does not recommend itself.

Respecting these words in *-ωπός*, the most probable view, so far as I now see, is that the mass of them were compounds of an active *-ωπό-*, and so oxytone; and that the few other compounds of like termination, which should have had recessive accent, were drawn into the analogy of the rest.

2.—*θεωρός*.

This word has received a variety of interpretations.

1. From *θεός* and *ῥα* or *-ωρός*: 'god-watcher,' 'caring for the god.' Hesychius: *θεωροί· οἱ φροντίζοντες περὶ τὰ θεῖα*: and so most ancients and moderns have taken it.

2. Pollux 2, 55: *ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς θεὸν ὀρούειν* (!), 'hastener to a god.'

3. From *θέα* and *ῥα*, *-ωρός*: "mit der *ῥα* der *θέα* (spectandi cura) betraut: wonicht gesteigert; die *θέα* (eifrig) wahrnehmend, d. h. ausführend"; Pott Etym. Forsch. II 3, 584, doubtfully.

4. As no compound at all, but a mere derivative from *θέα*; 'one who has to do with a spectacle.' So Curtius, followed by Vaniček.

Which of these is right ought not to be a matter of doubt. The first explanation falls to the ground by reason of the Doric form *θεᾶρός*,¹ as Ahrens, Dor. p. 182, rightly says. The second requires no serious notice. The fourth is refuted by the lack of all analogy for the *ω* in *θεωρός*. There is not a single derivative in *-ωρός*; on the contrary, the very numerous formations with suffix *-ρο-* from *α-* and *ο-* stems have mostly the form *-ηρός*, as *μελετηρός*, *ἀτηρός*, *λυπηρός*, and about forty others (but *ἀνιᾶρός* from *ἀνία*); a few end in *-ερός*, as *σκιερός*, *φοβερός*; still fewer in *-ᾶρός*, as *νεᾶρός*. Accordingly, from *θέα* we might have Doric and Attic *θεᾶρός*, Ionic *θεηρός*, but never *θεωρός*.

Pott's idea is the only one that meets the case. From **θεᾶ-φόρος* we should get by the regular contraction *θεᾶρός* in Doric, *θεωρός* in Attic. The only question is whether the original meaning is really 'overseer of a spectacle,' and not rather 'onlooker at a spectacle,' according to Pott's second thought. For this latter speaks the use of *θεωρός* in Choeph. 246 (*Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ, θεωρὸς τῶνδε πραγμάτων γενοῦ*), and two other places in Aeschylus, where it means simply 'spectator,' *θεατής*; also the prevailing use of *θεωρέω*.

The objection which Ahrens (l. c.) makes to this derivation has little weight. It is true that *θεάομαι* is in Doric *θαέομαι*; nevertheless the noun **θαᾶ* might have been lightened to *θέα*, even in Doric itself. And in any case **θαᾶρός* would be too clumsy to have maintained itself.

3.—Ποιέω.

In an old Argive inscription recently discovered at Olympia occurs the form *ΕΠΟΙΦΕ* □ *Ε*; that is, *ἐποιήφη* = *ἐποίησε*. The appearance of *Φ* in this word I have not seen accounted for. E. Curtius, who edited the inscription in the *Archaeologische Zeitung* xxxiv (1876), 1, was puzzled by it, and Cauer in his *Delectus Inscriptionum* cannot explain it: "nam quamquam in stirpe verbi *ποιεῖν* *φ*υ radix latere videtur . . . tamen in ea tale vestigium *υ* vocalis servatum esse non crediderim"; and he thinks it may have arisen "depravata pronuntiatione." But it does not seem needful to resort to this last supposition. *Ποιέω* is a derivative verb from *-ποιός* (*λογο-ποιός*, *ὄπλο-ποιός*). Whether with G. Curtius we refer this to root *φ*υ, 'beget' (cp. *παιδο-ποιός*, *ποιεῖσθαι παῖδας*), or with

¹ Also Elean, as we see from the long Elean inscription lately discovered.

Vaniček and others to root *ku*, 'beat,' 'hammer,' we must in either case suppose **ποF-ιό-ς* and from it **ποF-ιέ-ω*. Hence to **ποιFός*, *ποιFέω* is an easy step: the epenthesis just as in *μοῖρα* for **μόρ-ια*, and countless other cases. I do not suppose it would be easy to show another case of epenthesis with *van*, but as it can be proved for almost every other consonant, and is most common with the continuants, there is nothing strange in it here. I take it that in most cases where *Fi* came together (**εὐνόF-ια*, **γάF-ια*, etc.) the *F* disappeared before the epenthesis had time to set in, but we have only to suppose that the Argive dialect held to the consonant in this word with a little extra tenacity.

4.—*Δαίφρων*.

It may seem almost presumptuous to offer anything about this much-discussed Homeric word; yet I cannot help thinking that just the right view of it has been hitherto missed. The case stands briefly thus:

From the ancients we have two interpretations: one, 'experienced,' 'skillful,' based on a derivation from *δαῖναι*; the other, 'valiant,' 'warlike,' referring the compound to *δαί* (dative), 'battle,' 'fray.' Modern scholars are divided between these two interpretations. Thus, Nitzsch, Autenrieth, Düntzer favor the former; Wolf, Hermann, Ameis, the latter; while Buttmann (*Lexilogus* 1, p. 200) laid it down, as is well known, that the word has the one meaning in the *Iliad* (except the last book), and the other in the *Odyssey* and *Il. Ω*, and that so there are two *δαίφρων*'s.

Buttmann was undeniably right in asserting a difference in usage. In the *Iliad* the epithet is applied as follows (I rely on Ebeling's *Lexicon*): to Achilles, six times; Diomedes, four times; Tydeus, three times; Aias, twice; Atreus, twice; Bellerophontes, twice; Priam, four times; Antimachos, twice; Odysseus, Idomeneus, Antilochos, Meriones, Peneleos, Cebriones, Peleus, Aeneas, Pandaros, Socos, Hippasos, Phorcys, each once. In every case to a warrior; for even Priam and Antimachos, who do not appear outright as such in the field, are yet princes who have, as a matter of course, seen their fighting days. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus is called *δαίφρων* nine times, and Alcinoos four times, Orsilochos and Anchialos each once; so, too, Polybos, a suitor; and another Polybos, father of Eurymachos: these are princes, and may be counted as warriors by implication, but less easily can Telemachos (δ 687) be considered so, and still less Polybos, an artificer of the Phaeacians (θ 373), and Anticlea,

the wife of Laertes (ο 356). Even Penelope was formerly called *δαΐφρων* instead of *περίφρων* in some copies at least, as we know from Eustathius and the scholiasts. And similarly in the Hymn to Demeter 359 we have *δαΐφρονι Περσεφονείῃ*. Finally, in Ω 325, *Idaeos*, the charioteer of Priam, is *δαΐφρων*.

All this is hardly fortuitous, and goes to show that in the later epos the word had altered its meaning somehow, so as to be applicable to unwarlike personages, even women. But every one must see the difficulty of supposing, as Buttman does, that we have two words of different origin. Are we to think, Nitzsch pertinently asks, that by *Ὀδυσῆα δαΐφρονα ποικιλομήτην*, Λ 482, any different Odysseus is meant from the one so described in η 168? On the other hand, it is not easy to get along with either interpretation alone. Those who hold to the derivation from *δαΐναι* apply it to warriors as 'skilled,' 'tried' in war, *δεδαηκότες ἀλκὴν*, but they do not show why in the Iliad it is applied to this kind of skill only, but to others in the Odyssey. Those again who think 'battle-minded' to be the original force are obliged to assume a very great change in meaning, so that the epithet as given to women shall signify no more than 'wacker' (Wolf) or 'spirited.'

Formally, neither derivation is, so far as I am prepared to say, impossible; yet it is to be observed that neither furnishes exactly the right stem *δαΐ-* for the first part of the compound. A noun-stem *δα-ι-*, from root *δα-*, 'learn,' is not only unknown but in some degree improbable. Rather the stubborn hiatus in *δαΐφρων* points to a lost consonant. The other derivation furnishes this consonant, for the Homeric dative *δαΐ*, 'battle,' stands without doubt for *δαF-ι*. But even this word gives us only a stem *δαF-*, not *δαFι-*.¹ It is true that the assumption of such a stem would be easy; *δαΐ* would then be to *δαΐ-φρων* as dative *ἀλκι* to *ἀλκι-φρων*.

But there is no need to assume a stem *δαFι-* at all when we have it right at hand in another word, which furnishes, it seems to me, a very fitting meaning for the epithet in question. This is the word *δαΐς*, plural *δαΐδες*. As used, the word means 'torch,' but its older meaning was presumably anything burning, 'firebrand,' 'blaze,' 'fire.' Its root is *du-*, *δαF*, 'kindle.' Indeed, it is almost certain that *δαΐ*, 'battle,' (compare *δῆϊος* and *μάχη πόλεμός τε δέδθεν*) is from the same root, and meant only the 'blaze' of battle; so that 'battle' would be after all only a metaphorical sense, unlikely to be used in

¹ The late accusative *δαΐν* (Callimachus) may, I take it, be left out of account.

a compound. That the δ in stems in $-t\delta-$ is only an accessory sound, is well known; so $\delta aFt-$, not $\delta aFt\delta-$, is the oldest form of the stem.

We get, therefore, 'fiery-hearted' as the probable meaning of $\delta a\tilde{i}-\varphi\rho\omega$, and this sense, we may suppose, was still fully alive in the Iliad. From this it is no great transition to 'high-souled,' 'spirited,' 'gallant'; and this, I think, is about the meaning of the word in the Odyssey and the Homeric Hymn. Pindar uses it of Alcmena, Pyth. 9, 148.

5.—*Siremps*.

Siremps, an old Latin legal term, means 'just so.' Usually in the connexion *siremps lex esto*, 'let the law be just so.' The fuller form *sirempse* occurs in the prologue to Plautus's *Amphitruo*, 73. Neglecting older and less successful attempts to explain the word, we have explanations from Ritschl¹ and Corssen.² Ritschl, regarding *si-* rightly as *si-c* without its *c*—the locative of the pronoun-stem *so-*—takes the whole as *si rē pse*, 'so in very fact,' whence *sirepse*;³ and he looks upon the *m* as a mere 'phonetic' insertion, like that in *rumpo* and *cumbo*. But the *m* in these words is not phonetic merely, but an organic addition to form the present stem, and the supposed insertion, between two words, is not very credible. Corssen does a little better, assuming *si rem pse*, *rem* being the accusative of 'specification.' But what has this strengthening particle *pse*, which elsewhere attaches itself only to pronouns, to do after *rem*, a substantive? **Si-pse* would be very conceivable, but hardly *si-rem-pse*. We cannot fancy any **res-pse*, **rei-pse*. I take the word rather as *si rem eampse*, 'thus in very fact.' *Eampse* is a known form (Plaut. *Men.* 772 and elsewhere): *m* in *rem* would be lost in this situation, and the three vowels, *e^mea* would readily contract into one.

6.—*Macte virtute esto*.

Macte in the few places where it occurs in verse before a consonant shows a short final \tilde{e} : Verg. *Aen.* 9, 641, *mactē nova virtute*, and twice in Statius.⁴ This, I suppose, is the reason why we

¹ Rhein. Mus. 8, p. 303.

² Ausspr. II, 847.

³ This form really occurs (along with *siremse*) in a passage of Charisius, but is probably nothing more than a scribe's error.

⁴ Two passages in early tragedies, Att. v. 305 R. and Inc. inc. v. 231 R. (*macte Pelopis* and *macte nitier*), are indecisive from the nature of the metre.

have all been taught that it is a vocative, and that in the phrases *macte virtute esto* and the like, it is used somehow irregularly or exceptionally for the nominative. This has been understood in two somewhat different ways. First, it has been looked on as an instance of attraction out of the nominative case into the vocative. So, among others, Reisig, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, 346, who puts it thus: "indem ein prädicat in einem satze, statt in dem nominativ gestellt zu sein, in dem vocativ steht, weil der satz an jemand gerichtet ist, auf welchen das prädicat bezogen wird." And as the standard Greek illustration of this, Theocritus 17, 66, ὄλβιε κοῦρε γένοιο, is always brought forward, which really does, at first view, seem a striking parallel to *macte virtute esto*. But the correspondence lessens on inspection. Theocritus's phrase is a bold and exceptional attraction, even for the Greek, which admits attraction of case so freely. The two or three other Greek passages which are cited as having the vocative by attraction are less abruptly peculiar.¹ But the Latin language is much less flexible in such matters, and the expression in question is an old and well-established phrase, not the bold venture of a poet. Then, too, in these Greek passages there is a vocative² close at hand to exert the attraction; in the Latin phrase there is often no vocative at all. Nor do the other instances of the like attraction in Latin stand on the same footing with *macte esto*. The most noteworthy are Hor. Sat. 2, 6, 20, *Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis*; Pers. 3, 27, *stemmae quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis, censuremve tuum vel quod trabeate salutas*; Tibull. 1, 7, 53, *sic venias hodierna*. Add Val. Flac. 4, 467.³ In these cases, it is clear, the vocative is not merely an address, it stands also for what should be a nominative in agreement with the subject of the verb. But it is equally clear that in these isolated passages we

¹ Soph. Ai. 694, ὦ Πάν, Πάν, ἀλίπλαγκτε . . . φάνηθι, and Aesch. Suppl. 535, γενοῦ πολυμῦστορ, ἔφαπτορ Ἴοῦς, are the chief instances. Soph. Phil. 760, Eur. Tro. 1221 cannot count (see Lobeck on Ai. l. c.), because the participle which here stands as copula is itself vocative, so that we have simple agreement rather than attraction. But ἀντὶ γὰρ ἐκλήθης Ἴμβρασε Παρθενίου, in a verse of Callimachus (Schol. Ap. Rh. 2, 866), goes beyond all these in boldness.

² Except in the fragment of Callimachus: see last foot-note.

³ Verg. Aen. 2, 283, 10, 327, Val. Flac. 1, 391, do not belong here. Nor do Catull. 75, 1, *Rufe mihi frustra . . . credite amice*; and Prop. 2, 12, 2, *lectule deliciis facte beate meis*: there is no attraction, only the normal agreement of cases.

are dealing not with a native idiom of the Latin language, but with a finality of expression which poets here and there imitated from equally exceptional expressions in Greek poetry. And the models for these Latin passages were no doubt found in the artificial Alexandrine poetry, as for instance the sample quoted from Callimachus.

A somewhat different view of the supposed vocative is that which regards *macte* as a sort of *fixed* or *petrified* case, no longer felt distinctly as vocative. In this sense Neue, *Lateinische Formenlehre*, II, p. 99, treats of it among the *adjectiva indeclinabilia*. See also Zumpt's *Grammar*, § 103. The idea would be that starting from a vocative *macte* it would have lost its force as a case of address, and so become somehow capable of standing for other cases. But it is very difficult to see how the first beginnings could have been made of using a vocative in construction with the predicate of a sentence. That the vocative should become a mere exclamation is natural enough: so *macte virtute!* but *macte virtute esto* would be conceivable only as a sort of mixture of two phrases, *macte virtute* (exclamatory) and *mactus virtute esto*, and I suppose the retention of the vocative form would be thought to impart something of the explosiveness of the exclamatory clause. So from *macte!* meaning substantially 'bravo!' we should have to fancy people beginning to say 'be thou bravo!' This is in itself difficult, and when now one takes into account the older use of the phrase it becomes wellnigh incredible.

The oldest use is sacrificial. *Mactus* means, I take it, 'increased,' 'magnified,' 'glorified,' from root *mag-*¹ Servius tells us that the expression was derived from the religious language, and we find it repeatedly used in the prayers given by Cato in his work *De Re Rustica*, as follows: *macte fercto esto; macte vino inferio esto; macte hisce suovitautilibus lactentibus immolandis esto*; and the like (chapters 132, 134, 139, 141). What would the vocative be doing here? *Macte* here does not mean 'bravo!' nor is there anything exclamatory or interjectional in the thought; it is not even 'O glorious Jove'; it is simply 'be thou magnified by these offerings,' always at the end of the prayer, and in a solemn but tranquil tone. Nor does the vocative of the god's name immediately precede; this may or may not be the case.

¹ Fest. p. 125, *mactus, magis auctus*. Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 9, 641, *macte, magis aucte, affectatae gloriae: et est sermo tractus a sacris, quotiens enim aut tus aut vinum super victimam fundebatur, dicebant, mactus est taurus vino vel ture: hoc est, cummulata est hostia et magis aucta*. But the usage shows that *mactus* was said rather of the god than the victim.

Now, dissent from this vocative view has not been altogether wanting. As early as 1827 G. T. A. Krüger, in his 'Untersuchungen aus dem Gebiete der lateinischen Sprachlehre,' Heft 3, p. 80, separated *macte* from the above-described cases of attraction, and recognized in it an adverb. Madvig says: "man pflegt dies wort mit unrecht als den vocativ eines sonst ungebräuchlichen adjectivis zu betrachten" (Grammar, § 268, a, 3 foot-note), but he does not tell us what it is. Weissenborn on Livy 2, 12, 14, calls it an adverb; and Roby (516), speaking of the shortening of the adverb-ending *-ē* in *bēnē, mālē*, adds with a 'perhaps' *mactē*. Roby is certainly wrong in classing *macte* with *bene* and *male*. In the shortening of the latter, two influences have co-operated: the well-known tendency to shorten iambic words to pyrrhics, and the frequency of these particular words. *Macte* is not a frequent word, and not an iambic word, and so it is hardly credible that as an adverb it should have been shortened, or should have a short *-ē* at all.

Now, if we examine the three passages, which, so far as I can find out, are the only evidence we have of the quantity of *macte*, we find, what nobody seems to have noticed, that there is in these no *esto* at all, and that nothing hinders our taking it outright as vocative. The chief passage is Verg. Aen. 9, 641. Ascanius has just killed Remulus with his arrow, and Apollo watching the conflict calls out *macte nova virtute puer; sic itur ad astra*, which is to say, 'bravo, boy, for thy youthful prowess; 'tis thus that immortality is gained.' The two other places are both in Statius' *Silvae*: 1, 2, 201, *macte toris, Latios inter placidissime vates*, and 1, 3, 106, *macte bonis animi*. And this leads me to my own view, which is that there are two *macte*'s: *mactē* vocative, used in pure exclamations, and *mactē* adverb, used in wishes along with *esto*. There occur also *mactus* nominative singular, *mactum* accusative, and *macti* nominative plural of this obsolescent word; and to make all clearer I will run through the bulk of the instances where the different forms occur.

1. The nominative *mactus* in a formula of Cato's (R. R. 134), *bonas preces precor, uti sies volens propitius mihi, liberisque meis, domo familiaeque meae, mactus hoc fercto*, 'glorified by this meat-offering.' Again along with *esto* in a sentence from a similar prayer, Arnobius 7, 31, *mactus hoc vino inferio esto*, where Cato in like cases gives *macte*; whence we see that *mactus esto* was said as well as *macte esto*.

2. The accusative, *mactum honoratumque*, in a Numidian inscription: see Neue II, p. 99.

3. The adverb *mactē*; first in the sacrificial formulae above described: *macte vino inferio esto*, and the like. *Macte esse* can be said just as *bene, pulcre esse*, which Plautus freely uses personally (*bene fui, pulcre simus*, etc.; Men. 485; Truc. 4, 2, 28; Merc. 3, 3, 21), 'to be well off'; so *macte esse*, 'to be in a glorified condition.' Later in expressions of applause and encouragement with *esto*, and with an ablative, mostly *virtute*. *Macte virtute esto* (Hor. Sat. 1, 2, 31; Sen. Ep. 66 end), 'be prospered' or 'increased in thy valor'; *macte virtute diligentiaque esto* (Liv. 10, 40, 11); *macte, inquam, virtute simulque his versibus esto* (Lucilius). Add Mart. 4, 13; Pacuv. v. 146 Ribbeck. In indirect discourse Liv. 2, 12, 14, *iuberem (te) macte virtute esse*, where the assumption of a vocative would be more than ever troublesome. A case with the plural will be noted directly.

4. The vocative *mactē*; without *esto*. In a fragment of Attius' Neoptolemus (v. 473 R.), *tū, uti dixi, mactē his armis, macta virtutem patris*, 'thou who art honored with these arms, do honor to thy sire's valor.' Again Attius (v. 305 R.), *maneds, his ante exilio macte Pelopiis ex terris!* where it seems to be ironical, 'honored with exile.' Later in exclamations of applause. Simply *macte* 'bravo!' (Cic. Att. 15, 29, 3; Fragm. of unc. trag. v. 231 R.; Val. Flac. 6, 547): *macte virtute* (Cic. Att. 12, 6, 2; Tusc. 1, 17, 40): *macte uterque ingenti in rem publicam merito* (Plin. Pan. 89), 'bravo, both of them!': *macte animo* (Stat. Theb. 7, 280): *macte hac gloria* (Plin. Pan. 46). The Vergilian passage and the two from Statius' *Silvae* have been quoted already. Exceptionally we find *macte* with the genitive, Mart. 12, 6, *macte animi . . . morumque tuorum*; and Stat. Theb. 2, 495; with an exclamatory accusative, Flor. 2, 18, *macte fortissimam et . . . beatissimam . . . civitatem*. In all these cases there is no need of supposing that *esto* or anything else is understood.

5. The plural *macti*, read at present only Plin. H. N. 2, 12, 9, *macti ingenio este*; and Curt. 4, 1, 18, *vos quidem macti virtute, inquit, estote*; which used, I dare say, to be taken as vocative, but on our theory will be nominative, corresponding to the *mactus* . . . *esto* furnished by Arnobius. Formerly *macti virtute inquit, milites Romani, este* was read in Liv. 7, 36, 5, but now Alschefski, Madvig and Weissenborn have replaced *macte* on manuscript authority. And it is noteworthy that in both the above passages of Pliny and Curtius, *macte* is found as a manuscript variant. If this reading is right, it seems to dispose finally of the

vocative theory, as *macte* vocative singular could not be used in addressing more than one person.

This theory of two different *macte*'s I would put forward with all due caution, as accounting best for the facts so far as I know them. It would be overthrown if it should be shown that *macte* with *esto* has anywhere a short *e*; it would be confirmed if it could be shown that it has a long *e*. But I have not been able to find any case of either.

7.—*Temperare*.

This verb certainly comes from *tempus*, whose stem *tempos-* appears in the form *tempes-* in *temperi* (locative) and *tempes-las*. But to trace its meaning is less easy. The way, however, has been paved for this by a brief but suggestive discussion of *tempus* and *templum* by Usener in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, vol. 117, p. 59. To reproduce the argument in full would be out of place here; its conclusion is that *tempus* meant primarily 'place cut off,' 'space marked off,' and was applied especially to sacred enclosures on the earth and the sacred augural divisions of the heavens—in short, meant precisely what *templum* afterwards came to mean. The word referred originally to *space*; the meaning 'time' is later, and came about in this way: the quarters of the heavens are thought of as corresponding to and standing for the parts of the day and year; east is morning, south noon, and so on; so *diei tempus* was originally the quarter of the sky where the sun stood. *Templum* (Plaut. *ex tempulo*) Usener takes for **tempus-lum*,¹ a diminutive of *tempus*; which evidently succeeded to its local use when *tempus* itself took on the temporal meaning. Not the least valuable part of Usener's article is the identification of *tempus* with the Greek τέμπη (= **τέμπεσ-α*, *tempor-a*), which contains precisely the same stem *tempes-*. The old meaning of τέμπη is shown to be 'sacred enclosures,' 'sacred groves' (= τεμένη).² The root is *tem-p-*; *tem-* 'cut' with a determinative *p*.³ It had been already sug-

¹ That *templum* stands for **tem-ulum*, **temlum*, with inserted *p*, as has been often represented, last by Vaniček, is disproved by *temp-ulum*. This form shows that the *p* is not there to keep *m* and *l* apart.

² Schol. Theoc. 1, 66: τέμπη γενικῶς μὲν τὰ ἄλση. Hesych.: τέμπη· τὰ σύνθενδρα χωρία. It is known that the name was not confined to the celebrated Thessalian valley.

³ Fick and Vaniček assume *tan-p-*, 'stretch': so make *tempus* = 'span,' and so 'time.' Others have connected it with *tap-*, 'warm' (*tep-or*); L. Meyer with *τόπος*. All three views are to be given up.

gested that *tempus* meant 'place,' and L. Meyer¹ had interpreted *ex tempore* as 'from the spot,' 'von der stelle aus,' 'auf der stelle,' just like *ex templo*. And *tempora*, 'temples' of the head, (this Usener does not mention) explain themselves as the 'spots,' 'places,' that is, the vital, tender spots. This etymology of *tempus* seems to me as clearly made out as anything need be, and it affords us an interesting glimpse into Graeco-italic religious notions. The older meaning peeps out in *anni tempora* (Lucret.), 'seasons' of the year, *extremum diei tempus*, *matutina tempora* (Cic.), and like expressions: compare *templa caeli* (Enn.), 'quarters' of the sky.

Now, of these two meanings of *tempus*, 'bounded space,' 'place,' and 'time,' which appears in *temperare*? The latter not at all, for *temperare* never has any reference to time. The verb arose and developed its meaning altogether from the older *tempus* of local signification. Conceivable meanings for such a verb would be (1) 'mark off into *tempora*, limited spaces'; (2) 'assign bounds, limited space, to'; (3) 'keep something within *tempora* or bounds'; or (4) intransitively, 'keep one's self in bounds.' Of these possible turns, only the three last distinctly appear; of the first I do not find trustworthy indications.²

'Restrain' is the commonest meaning of the verb, and the only one known to the earlier Latinity.³ Both the dative and the accusative constructions easily explain themselves, as do the same two constructions with *moderari*. *Temperare linguae, manibus, aetati* is to 'set bounds to tongue,' 'hands,' 'youthful passion'; *temperare vim, sumptus, libertatem, annonam*, is, with a slightly dif-

¹ Vergl. Gramm. I, 368.

² As an augural term the first supposed meaning would be very natural; *temperare locum*, 'mark it off into a *templum*'; or *temperare caelum*; and so it might pass into metaphorical use. One is tempted to recognize this in expressions like *temperare orbem* (Ovid Metam. I, 770; 15, 869), said of the Sun and Augustus; *Iuppiter arces temperat aetherias* (Ov. Metam. 15, 858); and Horace's *qui mare ac terras variisque mundum temperat horis* (Carm. I, 12, 15); an unknown comic poet (Suet. Oct. 68) wrote *viden ut cinaedus orbem digito temperat*? But against this is the fact that this use is not traced in pre-Augustan literature: so in all probability these seeming indications are illusory, and we have here merely an offshoot of the meaning 'restrain.'

³ Plautus has *temperare* eight times: twice with dative, three times with infinitive, twice absolute, once with *ne* and subjunctive. Terence has only *temperans* twice. An uncertain tragic poet (Cic. Div. I, 21, 42) has *temperaret tollere*. Lucretius does not use the word.

ferent turn, to 'keep violence, expenses, freedom, price of corn, within limits.' Then 'govern,' 'control,' *temperare ora, rem publicam*. This accusative construction I cannot directly exemplify from early Latin, but it seems to be implied in *temperatus, temperate*, used by Cato. Furthermore, this last *temperare* is capable of being taken reflexively or intransitively: 'keep one's self within bounds'; so *posthac temperabo*, 'I'll be moderate hereafter';¹ *temperare in amore*,² with infinitive, *temperare dormire*³ and the like, not infrequently, 'refrain'; later with ablative, *temperare a lacrimis*, etc. So, too, *temperans* as adjective, as early as Terence.

From this meaning 'restrain,' 'keep within bounds,' comes a rich metaphorical development: I mean the usage of *temperare* in the sense of 'apportion,' 'mix in due proportion.' I am aware that the dictionaries have long represented this as the first and fundamental meaning of the verb, and at first I was tempted to get this directly from a supposed *tempus* 'division,' which would be the oldest sense of the noun. But there are two weighty reasons against this. First, *temperare* in this sense is not found before Cicero; secondly, *tempus*, so far as our indications show, meant always a division of *space*, 'space cut off,' not a 'division' outright. So I now feel sure that this sense is a derived one. The starting-point for this usage I take to be the tempering of cold water with hot, or hot with cold; this was 'restraining' it within due bounds—*temperare calorem, frigus*. So on to *temperare solem umbra, temperatura caeli, intemperiae*, and other terms applying to atmospheric heat or cold. And from water again it was an easy step to *temperare pocula, venenum, aes*, etc.; till at last it was felt outright as 'mix,' and we have *temperare colores* (Plin.), *herbas* (in a healing salve, Ovid); and Cicero says *temperare acuta cum gravibus*, and *ex dissimilibus rebus misceri et temperari*.⁴

Accordingly we have, recounting briefly:

1. *temperare*, 'set bounds to' (dative).
2. *temperare*, 'keep within bounds' (acc.), and, derived from this, 'apportion,' 'mix.'
3. *temperare*, 'restrain one's self within bounds.'

The compound *obtemperare* presents, however, a fresh problem. I have not been able to satisfy myself in getting the sense 'yield,' 'comply,' out of the *temperare* above described. 'Restrain one's

¹ Plaut. Trin. 1187.

² Plaut. Epid. 1, 2, 8.

³ Prol. Plaut. Poen. 24.

⁴ Rep. 6, 18, 18; Off. 3, 13, 119.

self in another's presence' seems unsatisfactory; it is too far from the actual sense. Can it be that we have yet another *temperare* here? I will venture on two slightly different suggestions. From *χωρος* the verb *χωρεῖν* means 'move,' *cedere*—advance or retreat. Could we fancy that *temperare* was ever used in the same sense, then *obtemperare* would be parallel to *ἐπιχωρεῖν*: it would mean primarily *accedere*, 'come at one's call'; *ob* having its old force of *ad*. It would, therefore, be like *pārere*, originally 'sich einstellen,' 'present one's self';¹ and *obsequi*. Or—another possibility—we might suppose a phrase *ob tempore*, 'on the spot' (compare *op-pido*, that is *ob pedo*, 'on a level'), and thence an adjective **obtemperus*, whence *obtemperare*, with the meaning 'present one's self,' 'be on hand.' Is it perhaps conceivable that *obtemperare* was originally an augural term, applied to the birds or other signs that showed themselves in the 'fields' (*templa* or *tempora*) of vision? *Optemperare* in Plautus and Terence is always used of obeying the command of a *person*; not yet, therefore, *obtemperare rationi* or *auctoritati*, or such turns. Noteworthy is Ter. Adelph. 705, where the son tells his father to make the prayers to the gods in his stead, 'because you are a much better man than I, and they will surely pay more attention to you (*tibi optemperaturos magis*) than to me.'

Contemperare, the only remaining compound, arises from *temperare*, 'mix,' and belongs to the later language.

8.—*Intrare*, *penetrare*.

To these words we must add *extrare*, 'pass out,' in a verse of Afranius,² *simul limen intrabo, illi extrabunt ilico*.

Bopp³ divided *in-trare*, *pene-trare*, and recognized in the last part a primary verb **trāre* (like *stāre*), which he connected with the Sanskrit root *tar-*, 'cross,' 'pass over,' and saw in *trans* the present participle thereof. Assent, so far as *intrare* is concerned, is expressed by Corssen;⁴ G. Curtius, too, in his Greek Etymology understands *intrare* and *extrare* so; and Vaniček⁵ gives all three verbs as compounds of **trāre*. No other theory, so far as I know, has ever been given.

This view is attended with no difficulty or improbability except in the case of *penetrare*. As the first part of the supposed com-

¹ Vaniček, Etym. Wörterb., p. 503.

² V. 5 Ribbeck.

³ Gloss. Sanscr. I, p. 165.

⁴ Zeitschr. für vergl. Sprachf., 3, p. 292.

⁵ Etym. Wört. p. 290.

pound must be *penus*, 'store' (of food),¹ and as a verb cannot be compounded with a noun-stem, we should be driven to assuming that the word is a juxtaposition of some case of *penus* and **trare*; and stands—say for *penum trare*, which would be like *vēnum ire* (*vēnire*), *vēnum dare* (*vendere*), but with this difference that it would show no trace of its original form, as two separate words, in the earlier language. This is a small difficulty; a greater one is the Plautine use *se penetrare*; for the active meaning of the verb accords ill with the meaning of *tar-* and **trare*.

Now, of course, the great mass of verbs in *-are* are of denominative origin, and if it be shown that there existed in Latin noun-stems in *-o-* corresponding to each of the three verbs in question, will it not be far more likely that the verbs are simply derived from these nouns and do not contain any **trare* at all?

To *extrare* we have the stem *extero-* in *exterus*, syncopated in the adverb *extrā* (for *exterā*), ablative feminine. It is from *ex*, with comparative suffix *-tero-*.

In like manner *intrā* is ablative of a stem **intero-* (whence also *inter*, *inter-ior*, *internus*, like *exterior* and *externus*), corresponding to Greek *ἐντερο-* (*τὰ ἔντερα*, 'insides'). This, too, is a comparative formation, from *in*.

The noun-stem **penetro-* is proved by *penetralis*. The very numerous formations in *-ālis* are all denominative. The only ones I can find (I have to rely on Roby's and Leo Meyer's lists, as I have no absolutely complete collection of them) which are not clearly derived from existing nouns, are *vectigalis*, *fetialis*, *maialis*, *sodalis*, *canalis*, and perhaps *esurialis*; none of these has any connection with a verb in *-āre*, and there is no doubt that they are to be referred to lost nouns. *Penetralis* cannot, therefore, come from *penetrare*, but points unmistakably to a noun-stem **penetro-*. As to the meaning of this stem, we shall not be far wrong in assuming it to be 'inmost part' (of the house), comparing the adjective stem *penito-* and the adverb *peni-tus*. These are thought to come from *penus*, 'store,' 'store-room.' The suffix *-tro-* may or may not be the comparative *-tero-*.

We derive, therefore,

extrare from stem *ex-t(e)ro-*;
intrare " " **in-t(e)ro-*;
penetrare " " **pene-tro-*;

¹ Curt. Etym.³ p. 254; Vaniček, p. 449.

just like *superare* from stem *supero-*. The meaning of all these was apparently causative at first: so *se superare*, 'put one's self above' (*radiosus sese sol superabat ex mari*, Plaut. Stich. 365); *se penetrare*, 'put one's self inside' (*intra pectus se penetravit potio*, Truc. 1, 1, 23; so very often in Plautus¹); and presumably *se intrare* and *se extrare*, though these are not known. From this they came to be used intransitively, 'get above,' 'get inside,' etc.; and finally to take the accusative of that which is surmounted or entered; but *penetrare* and *intrare* are not so used in Plautus, who indeed has *intrare* but seldom.² The connexion between *intra* and *intrare* is further indicated by the frequency of *intra limen* on the one hand,³ and *intrare limen* on the other;⁴ while in the Menaechmi 414 we have *periisti si intrassis intra limen*.

Whether *trans* (Umbrian *traf*) is really the participle of a **trāre*, or that verb should be dispensed with altogether, I do not undertake to say.

FREDERIC D. ALLEN.

¹ For instance, Trin. 291, 314. Plautus has the intransitive *penetrare* only once, Bacch. 56. He has also *penetrare pedem*. In *penetrant se in fugam* (Amph. 250), and *se penetravit ex aedibus* (Trin. 276), the verb has come to mean no more than *praecepitare*, 'plunge.'

² Men. 414, Truc. 2, 1, 20.

³ Mil. Glor. 596, Cist. 3, 19, Most. 5, 1, 16.

⁴ Fragm. of Afranius quoted above; Cic. Phil. 2, 27, 68: other examples in the lexica.

II.—ON RECENT INVESTIGATIONS OF GRIMM'S LAW.

Ever since its discovery, more than fifty years ago, Grimm's Law has been the constant subject of discussions and investigations. Its bibliography will compare in extent with that of the Nibelungen and of other much mooted, perhaps never to be settled questions. Yet Grimm's Law differs from these. It is a generalization, based upon certain facts, sufficiently recognized by Rask and Grimm for the establishment of a principle, but not sufficiently understood and collocated and weighed by them to have made further investigation superfluous even soon after the discovery. What shall we say then of to-day, when the methods of investigation have been so greatly improved? There is a class of younger philologists in Germany and England who have so revolutionized the traditional methods, that they have received the name of the 'new school,' 'junggrammatische Schule.' Their principles have been repeatedly set forth and defended, *e. g.* in the review of Scherer by Paul in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, No. 22, 1879, in Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*, IV, 315, and VI, 1. In full sympathy with Brugman, Joh. Schmidt, Osthoff, Sievers, Verner, Paul and Braune in Germany, are Sweet, Nicol, Murray and others in England. They do not believe, as Mr. Ellis expresses it, that philology is mere 'radicarian linguistry,' or the philologist, according to Mr. Nicol, a sort of 'cross between an antiquary and a postagestamp-collector.' They hold that to understand prehistoric speech-forms we must start with the historical and living ones; that phonetic laws are as free from exceptions as physical and chemical laws; that physiological and psychological processes must be kept strictly apart. Free play is given to accent, analogy and form-association; 'false' analogy, the men of the old school like to call it. For letter-comparison is substituted sound-comparison, pronunciation for orthography, the thing symbolized for the symbol. Phonetics, *lautphysiologie*, plays a prominent part in the usual phonology, *lautlehre*. We hear now of a history of sounds and of pronunciation, formerly only of historical grammar and history of literature. It is my purpose to discuss in a paper, or two, what progress has been made in the study of Grimm's Law by these new methods, what some of the problems are that

remain to be solved; and if I sift the literature on the subject as far as I may, some of the readers of this Journal may thank me for it.

Grimm's Law consists in a shifting of the mutes, as follows (s. *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, p. 276): the sonants shift to surds, the surds to aspirates, the aspirates to sonants. This he considers a real circular movement, all three shiftings going on at the same time. The languages concerned are 1. Any member of the Indo-European family except Teutonic; 2. Any Teutonic except High German; 3. High German. I shall try to restate and illustrate the law in a way less open to objection, I hope, than the old one just given.

Let y represent the sonant stop and z the surd one. These two are tolerably fixed quantities. x shall be that very uncertain quantity, generally called 'aspirate,' which is as objectionable a term as 'hard' and 'soft' for surd and sonant. The three groups of languages should not be—1. Greek or Latin or Sanskrit; 2. Gothic or English or Low German; 3. High German. For the first group Parentspeech (Prsp.), for the second General Teutonic (G. T.) are the terms most in accordance with the facts. Greek θ did not shift to Low German d , nor this to H. G. t . The sound of the Parentspeech which in Greek became θ , became in G. T. d . By General Teutonic is meant that Teutonic language which existed before there was any Low German or Gothic or High German. The term Parentspeech is a favorite one of Prof. March.

The formulas run then as follows:

	Parentspeech.		General Teut.		H. G.
I.	x	>	y	>	z
II.	y	>	z	>	x
III.	z	>	x	>	y

The advantage of using $x y z$ in these formulas is, that they are employed as symbols in other sciences and have in themselves no meaning or force. Whenever I wish to apply one formula, say the first, to study the transition of $x > y > z$, to inquire into the causes of the transition, the first thing to do is to find out the sound-value of $x y z$ in the three groups. Scherer, Paul, Sweet and March have insisted upon this non-identity of letters and sounds, and have done much to clear away misunderstandings and hindrances and thus to advance our knowledge upon the subject. I am aware that Mr. Douse, in 'Grimm's Law: a Study' (London, 1876), has used H, S, A , as algebraical symbols, but they played the mischief

with him, because he does not appreciate the importance of the inquiry into the value of his *H, S, A*. It is wonderful what a damper such an inquiry is upon one's enthusiasm over the beauty, uniqueness and regularity of this famous linguistic phenomenon. When I read such statements of Mr. Douse,¹ "that these tabulations are of identical value, or severally represent precisely the same facts (differing only in order of sequence), will be seen by comparing the vertical columns of any one with those of any other"; or again, "Whatever phonetic operation, as it were, is executed upon the Classical system to produce the L. G. system, must also be executed upon the L. G. to produce the H. G.; and (what is equally important, but is rarely if ever made prominent) the very same operation, when executed upon the H. G. system brings us round again to the Cl. system." Indeed! I should say that to get from H. G. $x = ts$ or pf back to Prsp. $y = d$ or b would require not so much a surgical operation as a somerset or balloon-ascension. I believe Dr. Murray must have been reading just such erroneous statements as these when he wrote those indignant letters to the 'Academy' about two years ago (Feb. 23 and March 2, 1878), in which he went so far as to deny that there was any Grimm's Law. He really meant, I think, Grimm's Law is no such thing as Mr. Douse represents it to be, which is exactly the truth.

The symbols, instead of being a snare, should be a safeguard. Substitute in Formula I the dental mutes and we have—

$$\text{Prsp. } dh > \text{G. T. } d > \text{H. G. } t.$$

This shifting is beautifully regular. The only drawback about it is, that we are not sure of x , the starting point. The German translator of Mr. Whitney's *Altind. grammatik* says (§ 37), European scholars pronounce Skrt. dh as $dH = d +$ aspiration, nearly as in *kind-heit*. But this is an example for the eye merely, since *kind-heit* is pronounced *kint-heit*, whose medial sounds are rather surd tH than sonant dH . It is clear then, that the pronunciation of European Sanskritists will not help us out. The uncertainty of the acoustic value of Prsp. x is unfortunate, if Formula I is, as some think, the 'Kernpunkt des Problems der Lautverschiebung,' and if, as is probable, the whole shifting started with it. Paul, in *Paul und Braune's Beiträge*, p. 155, thinks, to be sure, that Arendt has put the existence of 'medial aspirates' out of doubt. But few will agree with him. What discovery did Arendt make? He observed (in 1859)

¹ Quoted from Rhys's review in the *Academy*, 1877, p. 123.

the pronunciation of Said Muhammed and claims that he pronounced a real dH , bH , gH . From this he concludes that twenty modern dialects in India pronounce it so, and then Sanskrit dH must have had that sound. Brücke investigated the pronunciation of the same native and observed no medial aspirate. Here were two flatly contradictory results. Which of the two observers was right? Brücke was under this disadvantage, that he had beforehand committed himself to the opinion that a medial aspirate was a physiological impossibility. Scherer and Max Müller, however, sided with Brücke, and Max Müller even tried to come to the rescue with the old Sanskrit grammarians. Curtius and nearly all other philologists accepted Arendt's statement, and in explaining the transitions from Prsp. $x > y$, gave x the value of sonant stop + surd breath, and found nothing easier and more natural than that dH should lose the H and become d . But in 1873 Mr. A. J. Ellis observed the pronunciation of two natives, Messrs. Gupta and Mookerjee, and discovered no sonant stop + surd breath, but sonant stop + "glottal buzz," accompanied "by a momentary energizing of the following vowel." While this was not exactly what Brücke observed, yet it would have told strongly against Arendt, had Ellis's observations been known to anybody in Germany except Sievers. Sievers, in his *Lautphysiologie*, p. 95, expresses the opinion that a sonant stop + surd breath was theoretically impossible and the Skr. medial aspirate must have been sonant stop + sonant breath. Though the *Lautphysiologie* did not come out till 1876, he claims he always held this opinion, and was delighted to see it confirmed by the facts observed by Mr. Ellis.¹ The impossibility then of $x = dH$ or bH or gH must be admitted, and with that the old theory of the transition of $dH > d$ by the loss of the second element falls to the ground. Curtius, and later Kräuter, have upheld this view. Scherer, and before him Raumer, discarded the medial aspirate and substituted the medial affricate $d\delta$ (Brücke's $d'z'$) for dH . The transition then was $d\delta > \delta > d$. This has been more fully established by Paul in his long investigation, *Paul und Braune's Beiträge*, I, 147-201, and may be called the Scherer-Paul theory. But Paul is inclined to start with Prsp. dH and then $d\delta > \delta > d$. He finds it hard to accept with Scherer the primitiveness of medial affricates. But this is not

¹ For a full account of Ellis's and Brücke's observations see Ellis' *Early English Pronunciation*, p. 1134-1137, and Brücke's *Grundzüge*, etc., pages 115 and 116, new edition.

at all necessary. We must start with the true medial aspirate of Sievers and Ellis, which we shall transcribe as d' . This is a double sound, consisting of sonant stop and voice, which is continued after the d explosion until the 'jerked' vowel commences. The series then was $d' > \delta > d$. As soon as the d closure was slackened in the least, the homorganic sonant spirant began, and, as is generally the case, the second continuant element prevailed over the first explosive one. But if, with Scherer and Paul, we retain the medial affricate, the development of that from d' is more natural than from dH . The more stopping-places we can find in the passage of one sound into another, the more time is gained, the less the chances of collision with other sounds. Only the intermediate sounds must not be 'aus der Luft gegriffen,' but must actually occur and must not mislead. The seeming transition, for instance, of Prsp. $t > G. T. d$, in Formula III, has many intermediate sounds, but they are all verified. The transition was $t > tH > tth > th > \delta > d$. tH occurs in Sanskrit and in Southern German dialects; tth in the Irishman's 'thin.' th is the surd spirant, δ the sonant one. Formula I runs nearly parallel to this: $d' > d\delta > \delta > d$. d' occurs in modern Bengalese dialects; $d\delta$ sometimes initially in modern English. Physiologically the transition is as follows: Adding a vowel, we have $d' > a$, in which $>$ indicates Sievers' 'tönenden hauch' after the explosion of d . With the least relaxation of the d closure we have the beginnings of the sonant spirant, which will increase as the first element decreases, detracting also from the energy ('jerk') of the following vowel. Both in surd and sonant affricates the second element encroaches upon the first, as a rule, until the first is lost entirely and a simple sound is the result, as Greek $tH > \theta$, H. G. $\phi f > f$.

For all three classes of mutes in Formula I, Paul has shown that they reached the sonant stop only in the beginning of the word, and that the guttural sonant spirant appears even there in Oldest Low German and Anglo-Saxon, but that medially the sonant spirant appears except after nasals. Zend, Keltic, Slavic and Lithuanian show the same shifting. In the last two the sonant stop is always reached, whether initially or medially.

A most extraordinary development is that of the Greek surd aspirates and spirants from Prsp. x . It is a difficult question, and I only mention it now, lest I seem to underrate its difficulty. But is not the transition from our value of x made more difficult still? I dare say it is, but the other transition was made easy by starting

with a fictitious value that would best suit the result. We cannot regret that Curtius' plausible explanation in his *Grundzüge*, p. 393, viz: by assimilation of dH , bH , gH to tH , pH , kH (later $> \theta$, φ , χ), falls to the ground. Kuhn, Sonne and others claimed that this transition was a 'strengthening,' which would have been against the main drift of the whole Lautverschiebung, and that kH , tH , etc., must have been the original Prsp. sounds, from which gH , etc., arose by 'weakening.' While it was easy to refute Kuhn's opinion on other grounds, the objection of 'strengthening' seemed to stand, and so Curtius resorted to assimilation. The second element was surd breath, the first was sonant. They must both become surd, hence kH . Now this very incongruity of sonant and surd, which necessitated their assimilation, is one of the reasons for the non-occurrence of any such compound as dH . If d' was the value of x , its transition into tH or th was chiefly a matter of sonancy and surdness. But this question is connected also with another, which even Curtius (p. 84) admits is still an open one, viz: whether there were not surd aspirates by the side of sonant aspirates in the Parentspeech. Grassmann held that such was the case. The Italic correspondents are f for b' and d' , h for Gr. kH < Prsp. g' , and in Latin medially the homorganic sonant stops.

The order of the shiftings I must leave for another time. I have already used so much space for this formula that I must despatch the rest more rapidly.

Formula II with dental mutes becomes—

Prsp. $d > G. T. t > H. G. ts, s$.

The value of all of these is fixed. 'Aspirate' does not at all apply to H. G. x , even if it should to Prsp. x . ts is beyond the line of mutes and is a surd affricate. The signs for H. G. x are very numerous, but do not concern us now, and one kind of z is difficult to print.

Formula III becomes—

Prsp. $t > G. T. th > H. G. d$.

G. T. th was the surd spirant; H. G. d does not appear regularly. Finally, it was probably surd. Other signs for it are t , th , dh . The labial mutes introduced in our schedule will give us in Formula I—

Prsp. $b' > G. T. b > H. G. (p) b$.

To Prsp. b' correspond Greek φ , Latin f and medially b . y is lip-shut-voiced and z lip-shut-voiceless, but the exception rather than the rule, no shifting having taken place.

Formula II becomes—

Prsp. $b > G. T. p > H. G. pf, f.$

H. G. pf , like ts (z), is the double sound, called affricata by some in distinction from the simple spirant or fricative. Other signs are $pph, ph, v. f, ph$ and v represent the same sound, viz: lip-teeth-open-voiceless. The second shifting was also shared by the numerous O. H. G. words borrowed from other languages, and such a pf or f does not go back to Prsp. y , but z .

Formula III—

Prsp. $z > G. T. x > H. G. y,$

is too large for the labials. There is no shifting from G. T. $f > b$, and it is merely Prsp. $p > G. T. f$, particularly when initial. f was originally only surd spirant, but became then sonant medially. The guttural or palatal mutes substituted in the schedule will read in Formula I—

Prsp. $g' > G. T. g > H. G. (k) g.$

To g' correspond Gr. χ , Latin h and g , Sanskrit h as a rule. For H. G. the rule is g , the exception k , hence no shifting. The sign $gh = g$. ch occurs finally in Otfried, and was then back-open-voiceless instead of back-shut-voiced.

Formula II would read—

Prsp. $g > G. T. k > H. G. ch, (k.)$

ch may be considered the rule in O. H. G., but now k is more common. ch is back- or front-open-voiceless, according to the vowel immediately near it.

Formula III reads—

Prsp. $k > G. T. h > H. G. h (g).$

No second shifting is the rule. Initial h in both G. T. and H. G. is surd breath. Like the other G. T. surd spirant, h could become sonant medially and then g (Verner's Law). H. G. medial and final h, hh, ch have the same value as the preceding ch .

Now if this be a correct statement of the principle, several points are clear, which have been frequently covered up by false comparisons and figures of speech. The shifting is not circular, and cannot be compared with the movement of the wheels of a wagon or of the spokes of a wheel, or with three bent arrows pursuing one another in a circle. The varying values that the aspirates assume forbid it, and so does the incomplete shifting of H. G. The process is not 'weakening' or 'lightening of sounds' alone, as some claim.

Call 'weakening' ease of utterance or euphony and we grant that it plays an important part in Grimm's Law, as it does in all phonetic changes. Euphony explains Prsp. $x > G. T. y$, perhaps Prsp. $z > G. T. x$, but surely G. T. surd stop into H. G. surd affricates is no weakening process, for in this Grimm saw, or thought he saw, evidence of the manly, warlike spirit of our ancestors.

Prof. March, in the excellent treatise mentioned below, was the first to give prominence to a tendency so strong in the High Germans of to-day, of unvoicing sonants. It certainly explains the passing of G. T. sonant stop into H. G. surd, and yet this is strictly carried out only in the dental mutes. The passing of Prsp. $y > G. T. z$ is, however, nothing but loss of sonancy. Under this head would also come the development of Greek and Latin surd aspirates and spirants from Prsp. x . Raumer and Scherer are always on the hunt for missing links that are to bridge over the chasm, generally imaginary, between two sounds. Thus they have put between d and t , for instance, 'die geflüsterte Media' as transition sound. Now d is the point-stop-voiced and t is the point-stop-voiceless, and no transition sound is called for. No one single fact or principle has yet been discovered and proposed that will explain all the shiftings of Grimm's Law. I believe none will be found, and it is a mistake to look for one. Foreign influence upon the High Germans was first brought forward by Scherer to explain the second shifting. Prof. March favors this idea. Dr. Murray suggested the influence of the early inhabitants of Southern Germany, upon whom the Germans forced their language. Scherer suggests Romance influence. These are valuable suggestions, and the right direction and principle have been pointed out in which sound results may be obtained. Granted foreign influence upon the dialect of one tribe or district, how would this affect the sister dialects? Such a question cannot be correctly answered until the importance of the study of living dialects upon the old ones is more fully recognized by investigators. The Old High German dialects have lately received much attention from Braune, *Zur Kenntniss des Fränkischen*, and Heinzel, *Niederfränkische Geschäftssprache*.

Much emphasis has been laid by Dr. Murray upon the incompleteness of the H. G. shifting in the letters already referred to. His protests and strictures are indeed called for, and would have had more effect if he had not gone too far in some directions. That the O. H. G. shifting is historical and recent was, it is true, admitted by Grimm, but he liked to lose sight of the fact whenever he wanted

to 'magnify the law.' His framework is much too big for the facts. But is there also a difference in kind between the shiftings as well as in extent?

Most certainly, and while Dr. Murray overlooks the unvoicing of the sonant stops of the Parentspeech and General Teutonic, which is repeated in High German, all before him have overlooked, or at least not appreciated, the differences in the first and second shiftings. The shifting of G. T. $y > H. G. z$ and that of Prsp. $y > G. T. z$ are identical. It is the same process—loss of sonancy. This shifting was repeated a third time in the exceptions which Verner's Law accounts for. Prsp. *patar* became first *patHar*, then *fathar*, *faðar*, *fadar*. This G. T. sonant spirant or stop underwent the same fate as the sonant spirant or stop that arose from Prsp. $x (= d')$ and both became surd in H. G. Thus the t of New H. G. 'tun' and 'vater' are of very different origins, yet their last changes were identical, if not contemporary. But the H. G. shifting differs from the G. T. very much in kind. Thus H. G. x , excepting of course non-shifting, is not at all identical with General Teutonic x , though both arose from surd stops. H. G. x is either surd affricate or spirant, G. T. x only surd spirant. Hence the transitions from Prsp. and G. T. z to these sounds cannot be put side by side.

The uniqueness of Grimm's Law has been made more prominent than there is ground for. When we consider that the change of Prsp. x into spirant or stop took place as strictly in Slavic and Lithuanian as in G. T.; that it occurs in Sanskrit, in Keltic and medially in Latin; that the changes are not merely from one group to another, but within the same group and language; that in the labial and guttural mutes (except $k > ch$) there was no shifting in H. G.; that in modern languages we find many parallel transitions, then we shall be less inclined to consider the *lautverschiebung* as such an extraordinary phenomenon. We shall be better disposed and fitted to investigate it from the fruitful side and with proper methods. Any mingling of aesthetics and patriotism with phonology, '*lautphysiologie*' and dialect-study, within whose spheres the phenomena fall, is entirely unscientific. We can pardon it in Grimm in the enthusiasm of discovery, and in Scherer, who claims the prerogative of Lessing's genius as an excuse for his mistakes, which, he is sure, will lead others on the right track.

We come now to the exceptions. Onomatopoetic words remain unchanged from their very nature. The surd mutes p, k, t , in

close contact with preceding spirants cannot shift, hence *st*, *sk*, *sp*, *ht*, *ft*, are unchangeable. *d* is sometimes protected by *n* and *l*. In 1862 Lottner made a very careful examination and collocation of the exceptions to the first shifting in Kuhn's Zeitsch. XI, 161-205. Besides those above mentioned he found two classes of exceptions. The first is in Formula I. In them Gothic *y* (sonant stops) appeared to correspond to Skt. *y*, and there was no shifting apparently, *e. g.* Gothic *dauhtar* = Skt. *duhitar*. The second is or was in Formula III, in which both Gothic sonant stops and surd or sonant spirants corresponded to Skt. surd stops, *e. g.* Gothic *bairand* = Skt. *bharanti* (*d* = *t*) and Gothic *fadi* = Skt. *pati*. The first class had been allowed to pass partly because it was considered quite natural that there should be exceptions, and they proved the rule, partly because the Sanskrit forms were supposed to be identical with the Parentspeech forms. Grimm always put some one of the Indo-European family of languages as the first member of his schedule. It was Grassmann's great merit to have proved in his article 'Ueber das ursprüngliche vorhandensein von wurzeln, deren anlaut und auslaut eine aspirate enthielt' (Kuhn's Zeitsch. XII, p. 110-138), that Sanskrit was not primitive in this case, that the Parentspeech had had a 'medial aspirate,' if that be the value of Prsp. *x*, and that hence the exceptions to the first class were not exceptions at all. We had not started with the right Prsp. letter, but with the Sanskrit or Latin or Slavic. In other words, there was a shifting of *x* > *y*, which was so general as to extend over Sanskrit, Greek and Latin partially, over Slavonic, Keltic and Teutonic wholly. Grassmann demonstrated this within a year after Lottner's article appeared.

The second class of exceptions, that of the G. T. double correspondences (sonant stop and spirant) to Prsp. surd stop, waited for an explanation much longer. That the shifting was not directly from *t* to *d*, for instance, was recognized already by Raumer in 1837; again maintained by Scherer (Zur Gesch. der deutschen Sprache,) and by Paul (Zur Lautverschiebung) in Paul und Braune's Beiträge I, 147-201. The transition is now generally put down and accepted as follows: *t* > *tH* > *th* > *ð* > *d*. The first part, *t* through *tH* into *th*, is the regular shifting. The surd stop became first dental aspirate in the strict sense, *t* + *H*. The aspirate became surd spirant. The exception lies in this, that it did not remain surd, but became sonant medially, and then the sonant stop. How is this change to be accounted for? Verner discovered the reason.

It lies in the accent. Mr. Sweet framed a very bold theory in his edition of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, published by the Early English Text Society, in which he puts down the following series: Prsp. *t* > oldest Teutonic *d* > oldest Low German *dh* > oldest H. G. *d*. The primitiveness of *d* is based chiefly on the frequent and easy interchange of *d* and *dh*. Prof. March, in an article 'On Recent Discussions of Grimm's Law,' Transactions of the American Philological Association, 1873, objected very strongly and effectively, and if he did not overthrow Sweet's position, Verner's Law certainly did, as Mr. Sweet handsomely acknowledges in a letter to the 'Academy,' February 9, 1878. Paul, in the article referred to, though the subject of his investigations is really Formula I, has much to say about Formula III and its exceptions. He tries to make out, that medial *b, d, g*, are really sonant spirants in Gothic (p. 151); that the only difference between medial *d* and *th* is that *d* is sonant spirant and *th* the surd one. And one of the reasons adduced is also the easy interchange of *b, d, g*, with the corresponding spirants. Both Sweet's and Paul's theories are indirect unsuccessful attempts at explaining the exceptions of Formula III. Though Paul's idea of the manner of the transition is perfectly correct, of the cause he had no idea.

I shall try now to state and illustrate Verner's Law as briefly and clearly as I may. His own statement of it is this:

"Indogerm. *k, t, p*, gingen erst überall in *h, th, f*, über; die so entstandenen tonlosen fricativae nebst der vom Indogerm. ererbten tonlosen fricativa *s* wurden weiter inlautend bei tönender nachbarschaft selbst tönend, erhielten sich aber als tonlose im nachlaute betonter silben." Paul, in P. und B. Beitr. V, 538, restates it in this way: "Die nach vollzug der germanischen verschiebung vorhandenen vier harten reibelaute *h, th, f, s* sind ausser in den verbindungen *ht, hs, ft, st, sk, sp, ss*, erweicht, wenn der nächstvorhergehende sonant nicht nach der ursprünglichen betonung den hauptton trug." Omitting *s* at first, it would read in this way: Prsp. *k, t, p*, shifted without exception to *h, th, f*. But these became medially in unaccented syllables sonant spirants, except in certain surd consonant-combinations. This is sufficient, if every medial *b, d, g*, in Gothic or Aags. are sonant spirants. But if not, we must add "and these sonant stops"; *s*, though not within the limits of Grimm's Law, joins the other spirants. Then it may be stated as follows: Medial G. T. *h, th, f, s* become the sonant spirants *gh, dh, v, z*, in unaccented syllables, and later the sonant stops *g, d, b*, and *r* (= point-open-voiced).

A fictitious word *asataka*, after Verner's *akasatam*, would take these shapes in General Teut., Gothic and H. G., having passed through *asatHakHa* and *asathakha*, according to the primitive accent:

G. T. ásaðagha-, azáthagha-, azaðákha-, azaðaghá-,
 Goth. ásadaga-, azáthaga-, 'azadákha-, azadagá-,
 H. G. ásataga-, arádaga-, aratákha-, aratagá-.

As examples of actual words these will suffice:

Skt. bhrátar	G. T. brōthar,
but " pitár	" fadar,
and " mātár	" mōdar;
" ántara	" anthara,
but " antár	" undar;
" çváçura	" swehra,
but " çvaçrú	" swegrā.

Skt. pf. ind. sing. bibhédā, bibhéditha, bibhédā =
 G. T. pret. ind. sing. laith, laist, laith (not etymologically of course); but

Skt. pf. ind. pl. bibhidimá, bibhidá, bibhidās =
 G. T. pret. ind. pl. lidum, liduth, lidun.

Skt. causatives have the accent upon the ending, *bhārdya*, which shows itself in G. T. causatives, *e. g.* G. T. *hangjan* from *hanhan*, *laidjan* from *lithan*, *nazjan* from *nesan*.

The comparative is interesting. Since there is a retraction of the accent, as in ἡδύ-, ἡδιον, ἡδιστος, when it rests in the positive upon the second syllable, the G. T. ending must always be *-izan* and *-ozan*, later *-iro* and *-oro*, *e. g.* *batizan*, Ags. *betra*; *blindozan*, O. H. G. *blindoro*.

It would be interesting to trace Verner's investigation from the beginning and see how he was gradually led up to the discovery. We must be satisfied with reproducing here an equation from p. 109:

G. T. $\frac{\text{tehan}}{\text{tegu}} = \frac{\text{slahana (inf.)}}{\text{slagana (p. p.)}} = \frac{\text{brōthar}}{\text{mōdar}} = \frac{\text{kwethana}}{\text{kwedana}} = \frac{\text{mūsi}}{\text{deuza}} = \frac{\text{keusana}}{\text{kuzana}}$

He reasoned correctly that an explanation of one of these must be an explanation of all. He found the clew in the second, fourth and sixth fractions, which illustrate that remarkable phenomenon called 'grammatische wechsel' in O. H. G. and M. H. G. grammar. The last one who wrote upon this subject before Verner was Braune, P. und B. Beitr. I, 513. Braune says that hitherto we have been satisfied with merely stating the fact of the change, without showing the inner connection between these separate phenomena. Paul's

theory of the origin of sonant stops and sonant spirants proves this inner connection, as he will proceed to show more fully. In fact, Braune sees in the 'grammatische wechsel' proof of Paul's theory. But when he begins to realize fully that Gothic especially and old Saxon and Frisian do not follow suit, he says: "Ueberhaupt aber muss man das wol beachten, dass dieser ganze lautwandel nicht auf einem streng-durgeführten lautgesetz, sondern nur auf einer sehr ausgeprägten lautneigung beruht." This distinction between a law and an 'inclination' would never do for a '*junggrammatiker*.' The trouble was with Gothic. It showed very slight traces of grammatische wechsel. Its primitiveness was not questioned on this point any more than that of Formula I. Verner's Law was not found, because it was not looked for, and the facts were not so properly and comprehensively grouped as in the above equation, in spite of Paul's and Braune's constant efforts and frequent publications. Scherer, who if he cannot solve a phonetic problem phonetically will resort to aesthetics and 'sprachgeist' and 'männische und weibliche periode' in literature and language, singled out *fadar* and *modar*, and accounted for their *d* because they were "more frequently used words than *brothar*." *Fadar* and *modar* must belong to the 'small coin of language,' and must have been used so much that they are worn smooth and have nearly disappeared in Gothic. *Modar* never occurs, only *aithai*; *fadar* only once, in its stead *atta*, while *brothar* has no synonym at all. No; the accent explains either all members of the above equations or none. *Slahana* inf. has the primitive accent on the stem, *slagana* the past-part. on the suffix. The same is true of *quethana* and *keusana*. The pret. sing. was accented on the stem, the pret. plur. on the suffix. The 'grammatische wechsel' is a part of that so-called great exception to the first shifting. It is that general Teutonic shifting of surd spirants to sonant ones and sonant stops in unaccented syllables. If one dialect, whether old like Gothic or young like modern English, does not conform to this law, what seems an apparent exception must be accounted for in some way or other by tendencies and phonetic principles within that individual dialect. Gothic, for instance, must have once had grammatische wechsel. It traces of it now, e. g. *aih-aigum*, *tharf-thaurbum*, *filhan-fulgins*. There is a tendency in all languages, and very strong in Gothic, called 'ausgleichung' by German scholars, levelling or striving after uniformity. In Gothic it manifests itself clearly in the reintroduction of *i* and *u* for *e* and *o* in G. T. and the sister dialects, which gives it that appearance of primitiveness. Thus it has made the

pret. pl. and past-part. again like pres. and pret. sing., and *z* in declension again *s*. But *z* has never become *r*, as in the other dialects. In Goth. we have *tiuhan*, *tauḥ*, *tauḥum*, *tauḥans*; *h* is uniformly restored. In Ags. we have *tiohan*, *toh*, *tugun*, *togan*; in N. H. G. *ziehen*, *zog*, *gezogen*, which is more ancient on this point than Gothic. Again, in N. H. G. *zeihen*, *zieh*, *geziehen*, we have uniformity, as in the cognate Goth. *-teihan*, *-taiḥ*, *-taiḥans*. The N. H. G. class of verbs, *schneiden*, *schnitt*, *geschnitten*; *leiden*, *litt*, *gelitten*; *sieden*, *sott*, *gesotten*, is easily brought into line. The G. T. forms with the spirant became the H. G. forms with *d*, and those with *d* received in H. G. *t*, for instance, Angs. *snidhan*, *snadh*, *snidon*, *sniden* = O. H. G. *snīdan*, *sneid*, *snitum*, *snitan*. With the H. G. tendency to make a final sonant stop surd, and the good sense of the writers, especially of M. H. G., to spell as they pronounced, *leid* and *sneid* became *leit* and *sneit*, and then in N. H. G. *litt* and *schnitt*, the vowel difference between pret. sing. and plur. having soon disappeared.

But how and why did the accent produce such a remarkable effect? Admitted the tendency of any surd spirant to become sonant when surrounded by sonants—which is nothing but leveling—the question is, how did the accent preserve the surd character? Verner explains it in this way. The G. T. accent must have been one of stress also, and not of pitch merely, which was the primitive accent. The strong impulse of surd breath, when the stress is thrown upon the syllable with the surd spirant, would preserve this spirant as it was originally. Let the accent be thrown upon any other syllable, and the surd spirant will weaken from a fortis to a lenis, and then become sonant in sonant surroundings. (See Sievers' *Lautphysiologie*, p. 133.) I dare say, many will be satisfied to know that the preservation of the surd spirants *h*, *th*, *f*, *s*, or their transition to sonant spirants and to sonant stops, goes hand-in-hand with the original accent. Verner's Law settles also a point in the history of accent. The free Parentspeech accent was still preserved in G. T. after the beginning of the first shifting of mutes. When the characteristic Teutonic accent, which is limited to the stem-syllable, commenced, the shifting of spirants was accomplished, or at least so well under way that the new accent had no influence upon it. Had the G. T. logical accent been as old as was formerly supposed, it would have prevented this shifting.

Verner's Law strengthens the position of the 'junggrammatische schule,' claiming that phonetic laws admit of no arbitrary excep-

tions. They must and can be applied as strictly as physical laws, if they are laws at all. By Verner's discovery the last large class of exceptions to the first shifting in Grimm's Law has been explained. They have been proved not to be real exceptions. Prsp. *z* became G. T. *x* initially, medially and finally. But medially they shifted within the same group of languages a second time and a third time in H. G., at least in the dental mutes. Verner's Law has lately been studied and cleared up very much. See Fr. Kluge, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der germ. Conjugation*; Paul, *Zum Verner'schen Gesetz*, P. und B. Beitr. VI, 538. Sievers, P. und B. Beitr. V, 149, has already found a corollary: *g* (*gh*) disappeared between originally unaccented vowel and *w* already in General Teutonic. In Gothic we have uniformly *h* in *saihwān* (G. T. *sehwan*), *sahw*, *sehwarum*, *saihwans*, but Afs. shows the older forms, *seon* (for *sehon*), *seah*, *sāwon*, *gesewen*, where *g* from *h* is lost before *w* in the pret. plur. and past participle, though there are forms which still show it.

H. C. G. BRANDT.

III.—PRINCIPLES OF ORTHOGRAPHY OF FRENCH VERBS ENDING IN *-ELER* AND *-ETER*.

M. B. Jullien in his 'Revue de l'Instruction Publique' (Didot, Orthographe Française, p. 380) makes this remark: "I should like to find a list of verbs in *-eler* and *-eter*. I do not exactly know how many of them our language possesses, but if there were from two to three hundred I should not be surprised. These verbs present this peculiarity, that wherever the last syllable is mute the *e* preceding it *must* become open. This open *e* is marked either by a grave accent, as in *geler*, *je gèle*, *acheter*, *j'achète*; or by doubling the intermediary consonant, as in *appeler*, *j'appelle*, *jeter*, *je jette*; and every one knows how difficult it is to remember without any determining reason the choice which one must make between these two orthographies. But this is not all; for a great number of these verbs the Academy does not give any example where the last *e* is mute, so that the writer is free to choose between the two methods, and the critic is left free to condemn him, no matter which course he has taken."

The want thus complained of by M. Jullien I have endeavored to supply by making a list of these verbs in *-eler* and *-eter*, and in order to put an end to the very unsatisfactory state of incertitude as regards this question which his last words so forcibly illustrate, I have tried to find out if any principle had governed the choice of either orthography, and if so, what it was.

The number of verbs I have found, is 224: 129 ending in *-eter* and 95 in *-eler*, of which I will give a list further on. Of these the Academy only gives the conjugation in 108 cases; hence there are 116 verbs left to the option of writers. M. Littré, however, who, I think, can be taken as a very safe authority, in his 'Dictionnaire de la langue Française,' gives the conjugation of 94 of these 116 verbs, thus reducing to 22 the number of those left to our own choice.

These 202 verbs can be divided, according to the orthography observed in their conjugation, into five classes as follows:

I. Those verbs in *-eler* and *-eter* which double the *l* or *t* before mute *e*, as *appeler*, *j'appelle*, *jeter*, *je jette*, etc.

This class numbers 105 verbs (57 in *-eter* and 48 in *-eler*), more than half the verbs conjugated. They are—

arbreter	interjeter	appeler	étinceler
billetter	jeter	amonceler	ficeler
biqueter	lingueter	anneler	gabeler
briqueter	loqueter	atteler	grabeler
brocheter	louveter	bosseler	greneler
cacheter	mailleter	carneler	grommeler
cailléter	marqueter	chanceler	grumeler
*cliqueter	moucheter	chapeler	javeler
coqueter	mugueter	cordeler	jumeler
coupleter	naqueter	créneler	morceler
débonneter	paqueter	cuveler	museler
déboqueter	parqueter	décapeler	niveler
décacheter	pinceter	décheveler	oiseler
déchiqueter	piqueter	démuseler	paisseler
déjeter	pocheter	denteler	panteler
démoucheter	projeter	déniveler	pommeler
écolleter	recacheter	dépuceler	rappeler
émoucheter	rejeter	dessemeler	râtelier
empaqueter	saveter	dételer	renouveler
épinceter	souffleter	écheler	ressemeler
feuilleter	surjeter	écheveler	ruisseler
forjeter	tacheter	enficeler	taveler
fureter	teter	enjaveler	tonneler
gileter	tréjeter	ensorceler	
gobeter	valeter	épeler	
greneter	vergeter		
guériter	vigneter		
guillemeter	voleter		
haleter			

II. Verbs of this species which take a grave accent on the *e* which precedes the mute syllable, as *celer*, *je cèle*, *acheter*, *j'achète*.

This class has only 31 verbs, not one-third of the previous class and scarcely a seventh of the whole number. They are as follows:

acheter	fileter	agneler	encasteler
becqueter	jarreter	bourreler	engeler
claqueter	râcheter	carneler	geler
colleter		celer	griveler
craqueter		congeler	harceler
crocheter		déceler	marteler
décolleter		dégeler	modeler
étiqueter		démanteler	peler
		écarteler	régeler
		embreler	répeler

III. Verbs which are common, *i. e.* can be conjugated either by doubling the consonant *l* or *t* before mute *e*, or with a single consonant and a grave accent on the preceding *e*, as *breveter*, which, according to Littré, can be written *je brevette* or *je brevète*. We find 12 verbs belonging to this class—9 in *-eter* and 3 in *-eler*. They are :

aiguilleter	buffeter	trompeter	botteler
banqueter	caqueter		canneler
bonneter	dépaqueter		ciseler
breveter	épousseter		

IV. Verbs which have already an acute accent on the penult in the infinitive which they change to a grave accent in the present before mute *e*, but are regular in all their other tenses. This class numbers 29 verbs, which are :

affréter	empiéter	péter	anhéler
appéter	fréter	piéter	héler
admonéter	genéter	refléter	recéler
compéter	hébéter	rempiéter	révéler
compléter	inquiéter	répéter	sphacéler
concréter	interpréter	secréter	
décompléter	masséter	sousfréter	
décréter	mésinterpréter	végéter	

V. Verbs which have a circumflex accent on the penult in the infinitive. They are regular in all their moods and tenses, and number 25, as follows :

acquêter	entêter	bêler	prêler
apprêter	fêter	demêler	vêler
arrêter	prêter	emmêler	
conquêter	quêter	engrêler	
désentêter	requêter	entremêler	
écrêter	reprêter	fêler	
embêter	tempêter	grêler	
enquêter		mêler	

The 22 verbs, which for lack of authority I have been unable to assign to either of the first two classes, are :

baqueter	niqueter	bateler	hôteler
caneter	paleter	capeler	ponteler
chiqueter	pelletter	crêtelier	
corneter	planeter	empasteler	
culleter	sauveter	fumeler	
décliqueter	simpleter	fuseler	
haqueter		grappeler	

I have endeavored to give here a complete list of all verbs ending in *-eler* and *-eter*, but it is not my purpose at present to examine the principles of orthography with reference to the last two classes. I will confine myself to those verbs which are unaccented in the infinitive.

Why then is it that among these verbs some double the *l* or *t*, whereas others obtain the same result in pronunciation by accenting the *e*? I find the utmost confusion reigning among grammarians and even academicians as to this question. In fact three of the verbs above-mentioned, which I have on the authority of the Academy grouped in the second class, according to Littré should belong to the first. These verbs are: *claqueter*, *jarreter* and *décolleter*. I have searched in vain for some rule or principle among the most noted French grammarians, and though ready to seize the faintest hint, I have not found one who so much as gave an opinion on the subject, beyond saying that it was very awkward to have no definite rule on the subject.

I subjoin an extract which will show this confusion. In the *Grammaire des Grammaires*, of Girault Duvivier, (edited by P. A. Lemaire, Paris 1863, p. 511-12), we find the following peculiar way of getting out of the difficulty. In treating this question he says:

"En Français un mot ne peut pas être terminé par deux *e* muets de suite. C'est une règle qui ne souffre aucune exception. Mais dans ce cas faut-il toujours doubler la dernière consonne pour rendre le premier de ces deux *e* sonore? ou bien peut-on employer aussi l'accent grave? Nous ne trouvons point à ce sujet de règle fondée sur une base uniforme; il semble que l'usage seul, ait, au hasard, établi des différences. Ces mots sans doute se présentent rarement, nous pensons, toutefois, qu'il faut s'abstenir d'en faire usage."

This last suggestion has at least the merit of being thorough, but the spirit of the present day will not admit of such a conclusion. I could cite numerous other instances of confused ideas on this subject; in fact, take up any grammar you choose, you will find, either that the matter is quietly passed over in silence or that the author says he can give you no fixed rule for your guidance. Indeed it would be hard for him to do so when, as before remarked, two such high authorities as the Academy and M. Littré are at variance as regards certain verbs.

These examples prove clearly the confusion that reigns as to the proper way of conjugating some of these verbs, and it would seem

that no one up to this time had ever taken the trouble to enquire into the origin of this anomaly or tried to find a reason for this difference of orthography. Nothing, therefore, was left to me but to examine closely each verb in its origin and development, and by this means to find out what cause or causes had produced such a result. This examination has led me to the conclusion that it can only be ascribed to the influence of etymology.

These verbs are for the most part derived from the Latin, and at the time when the Academy published the first edition of its dictionary (in 1694), the influence of Latin among the literati was paramount; and at this epoch we find introduced into the language a whole host of new words formed almost without change from the written Latin. This, however, would prove nothing were not my conclusions substantiated by facts the consideration of which will enable the reader to judge whether this opinion is well grounded or not.

1. In the class of verbs of which *appeler* and *jeter* are the types and which double the consonant before mute *e*, I find eighteen derived directly from Latin verbs.¹ In every case the Latin verb has a double consonant in the infinitive.

2. On the other hand in the class of verbs such as *celer* and *acheter*, I find eleven derived directly from Latin verbs.² Of these only one has two *l*'s in the infinitive, and that is *encasteler*, a term of veterinary science derived from the Low-Latin *incastellare*, and a word not very often employed.

These facts in themselves, I think, are very strong proof that the etymology had a powerful influence on the different forms.

Admitting, then, that this principle accounts for the orthography of 18 verbs in the first class and 11 in the second, let us see now what we can do for the remainder. In the first class we have still 87 verbs to account for. Of these 64 are derived from diminutive forms and 6 are frequentatives, 15 are derived from nouns not

¹ e. g.: *appeler* derived from Latin *appellare*

atteler " " *astellare*

chanceler " " *cancellare*

jeter " " *jactare**

* the *c* being assimilated; ex. Ital. *gettare*, etc.

² e. g.: *celer* derived from Latin *celare*

geler " " *gelare*

acheter " " *adcaptare**

* the *p* being dropped and forming *acatare*, etc.

diminutives, and two from Keltic verbs. The Latin double-diminutives, as every one knows, were written with two *l*'s, as *auricilla*, *monticellus*. Hence it would follow according to the principle stated above, that verbs derived from these would also double the intermediary consonant in preference to accenting the *e*, where the pronunciation required it. The great number of diminutives contained in this class as compared with the second is, I think, a strong argument for my cause.

Of the 15 verbs derived from nouns, 9 of them have for roots feminine nouns, and 6 only have masculine forms. All the former terminate in a double consonant.

Passing to the second class, besides the 11 verbs already referred to, we find 13 diminutives and 3 frequentatives as against 64 and 6 respectively in the first class, also 4 verbs derived from nouns. Of these last *three* are masculine, and have only one consonant at the end, and *one* is feminine. Of the diminutives 11 are masculine nouns and two are feminine, which would lead us to believe that the tendency was to conjugate verbs derived from feminine nouns or from Latin diminutives as *appeler* and *jeter*, and derivatives of masculine nouns as *acheter* and *celer*.

From these figures, the result of a careful study of each verb, I think I am justified in saying that etymology is the cause which has determined the variations of orthography, and the fact that there are words which are conjugated in opposition to this principle does not in any way affect my argument. In the first place they are comparatively rare, and secondly their presence in the wrong class can be attributed to the confusion which exists among grammarians touching this question, (as shown by the extracts above given,) and which in the case of words for which usage and custom gave no rule, caused authors to employ either orthography as they themselves saw fit.

On the other hand if this was not the principle which guided the orthography it must be the pronunciation, as we cannot accept an empty word, *chance*, as a cause. This must have caused a preference for a double consonant after certain syllables and an accented *e* after others. But a casual glance at these verbs will suffice to show the fallacy of that argument. Why should *acheter*, for instance, have an accented *e*, while *cacheter* (the very same word phonetically) with a *c* prefixed, requires two consonants; or *appeler* take two *l*'s and *agneuer* employ an accented *e*? Were we to depend on the pronunciation as our guide we should find it

difficult to distinguish the difference between one orthography and another, as it would take a very fine ear indeed to observe any difference of sound in the last syllable of *j'appelle* and *je bourrèle*, for instance. There is to-day another tendency which M. Littré notices in his dictionary, and which I have often observed personally, and that is to retain the mute *e* in all cases in some verbs and say *e. g. je cach'te, je cach'terai, je bourr'le, je bourr'lerai*, etc., which would add another class to our already complicated list.

I am, therefore, convinced, in the absence of proof positive to the contrary, that etymology is the sole principle which presided at the formation of these two different orthographies. These verbs should, therefore, be classed as follows:

I. All those derived from Latin verbs having *ll* or assimilated *#* in the infinitive, or from Latin diminutives terminating in two consonants, or from feminine nouns, should belong to the first class and double the consonant before the mute *e*.

II. Those which are derived from Latin verbs having only one consonant preceding the termination of the infinitive, or from diminutives terminating in one consonant or from masculine nouns, should employ a grave accent before mute *e*.

The carrying out of this measure would involve a slight interchange from one class to another, but would have at least the merit of giving some guide as to which is the correct orthography for us to use, although it would suppose a knowledge of Latin and etymology which all do not possess.

On the other hand, although our philological sentiments could not countenance the overthrow of all principles of etymology and due development of the language, still it would simplify matters very much if the Academy, yielding to the demands of grammarians and others, should ordain that all these verbs be written alike one way or other. The principle which originally presided at the choice of either orthography has been so considerably overlooked already, and in fact so entirely unnoticed, that it would be no great change if it were completely banished; whereas the advantage to the learner, both native and foreign, gained by this increased simplicity would more than compensate for the loss of an obsolete principle.

Having thus, as I believe, satisfactorily disposed of the first two classes, verbs of the third class, (my principle once admitted,) can readily be assigned, according to etymology, to their respective places, as also the 22 verbs which I was not able previously to classify.

It does not enter into my plan to treat of the two remaining classes which, in their conjugation, do not present the same difficulty as those I have endeavored to examine. I will simply state that, in my opinion, the 29 verbs which have an acute accent on the penult in the infinitive are to those which have double *l* or double *l'* in the infinitive in the same ratio as the verbs I have grouped in the second class are to those of the first. The study of the principle in these cases is one I should very much like to see taken up, as it would have an important bearing on the question which has occupied me in this paper.

B. F. O'CONNOR.

IV.—XENOPHON'S OECONOMICUS.¹

In the preface the writer tells us that he does not propose to set forth a complete recension of the text of the *Oeconomicus*, but to exhibit the dialogue in its original form, divested of those additions which have been foisted into it from early times. He thinks it can be proved that the book as it came from Xenophon has been worked over by some other hand in a very unskillful manner, and that every one who is capable of forming an unprejudiced judgment will agree with him.

Herr Lincke's mode of dealing with his author is peculiar. In the forty-six pages of his Greek text there is no indication of an omission anywhere, except that the small marginal figures used to mark chapters and sections do not run on without breaks. Not merely has he removed from their proper places in the text the passages which he deems interpolations, but the longest and most important of these is not even permitted to appear in the book at all. The amount of his excisions on the whole will be understood from the following calculation:

In the Teubner edition the *Oeconomicus* occupies 71 pages, containing in all 2205 lines, more or less. Herr Lincke has printed a text with these omissions:

cc.	III	1—vi	II	396 lines
	VIII	3—8		31 "
	XI	12—13		13 "
	XI	24		5 "
	XIV	4—7		18 "
	XV	4—9		26 "
	XX	6—9		16 "
	XXI			73 "
				<hr/> 578

in all 578 lines out of 2205, or nearly a quarter of the whole.

¹ Xenophons Dialog *περί οἰκονομίας* in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt. Text und Abhandlungen von KARL LINCKE, Dr. Phil. Jena. 1879.

This is the treatise of which a critic so fastidious as Cobet (Nov. Lect., p. 568) can write, "venio nunc ad Xenophontis libellum quo non est alius ab eo nitidius venustiusque scriptus et magis expolitus et limatus," and of which George Long, the writer of the article in Smith's Dictionary, who would look at the matter from a point of view different from Cobet's, says "this is one of the best treatises of Xenophon," and which Grote can analyse without the slightest intimation that he finds it other than coherent and satisfactory. It happens, moreover, that we have unusually early evidence of the existence of our treatise in its traditional form. Cicero (de Off. II, § 87) speaks with admiration of the *Oeconomicus*, and says that in his youth he translated it into Latin. Parts of the suspected sections are quoted in the Cato Major: Columella quotes several other passages of Cicero's translation, some of them from the incriminated sections.

But it is not necessary to go into further detail to establish the unbroken tradition which defends the integrity of the treatise as we have it; for Herr Lincke himself admits that there is no evidence whatever of the existence at any time of a different edition of the work, and that it is certain that it must have been published before the expedition of Alexander the Great (334). Now, Xenophon died probably not earlier than 355; and we, therefore, have a period of less than twenty years within which the spurious passages, if there are such, must have been inserted. But the extreme improbability of a work's being tampered with so shortly after its publication, and the absolute want of evidence that the *Oeconomicus* ever existed as a published work in any other shape than that which it possessed till Herr Lincke took it to pieces, constrain him to adopt the theory that it was never published by Xenophon himself, but was found among his papers by the person into whose hands they came, and was given to the public after his death. Herr Lincke considers himself to have proved that this person was a mere beginner, as destitute of style as he was of practice, while even the chapters and sections added to this work show him to have improved as he went on. Still, notwithstanding the evident deficiencies which demonstrate that the interpolator belonged to a younger generation, his language betrays a near connexion with that of Xenophon himself, especially in those points which discriminate Xenophon's own style from that of the Attic classics. No teacher in Athens could have imparted such peculiarities. Nothing short of the influence of Xenophon's own individuality

could have produced such striking similarity in matter and manner. This exceeding similarity has indeed hitherto imposed upon all editors and interpreters; and we can explain it, as well as the author's familiarity with the Cyropaedia and his effort to work in Xenophon's own lines, only by the assumption that he was of kin to Xenophon, and received his earliest instruction from him. Since, further, there is no doubt that this young writer had in his possession several of Xenophon's works and undertook the editorial care of their publication, we may assert with considerable confidence that, as Xenophon's kinsman, he inherited his literary remains. The existence of such a kinsman is not left wholly to conjecture. There is a statement in Diogenes Laertius and another in Photius from which, it is said, it may be inferred that Xenophon's son Gryllus, who was killed before Mantinea, had a son named Xenophon after his grandfather. Diogenes Laertius speaks of a statement made by Deinarchus ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ξενοφῶντα ἀποστάσει; and Photius mentions a Xenophon, son of Gryllus, along with Theopompus and Ephorus, as among the pupils of Isocrates, by whom they were incited to the pursuit of historical study. Herr Lincke thinks the latter statement of importance as containing an intimation of the literary activity of the *younger* Xenophon.

Such is Herr Lincke's theory, in deference to which he has subjected the *Oeconomicus* to the treatment I have described. It will, I think, be admitted that this is a case, if ever there was one, in which the burden of proof rests upon the assailant. To one who desires to defend the integrity of the suspected passages no other course is open, or is needed, than to state with all possible fairness the arguments alleged against them, and in this way to leave the unprejudiced reader, to whom Herr Lincke constantly appeals, to decide for himself whether they are strong enough to support the conclusion built upon them.

Of the 114 pages devoted by Herr Lincke to his argument, 88 are taken up with criticism of the matter of the incriminated passages, which he endeavors to show are clumsy *emblemata*, foisted into the tissue of the dialogue, marring its symmetry, and standing in no organic relation to the genuine parts; the remaining 26 pages contain what he has to say as to the style and phraseology of the interpolator. It will be impossible for me, within the limits at my disposal, to touch upon more than the most important of these criticisms.

The dialogue in its traditional shape is divided by Herr Lincke into three portions. The first of these, cc. 1 and 2, contains the introduction. In c. 1 Critobulus and Socrates discuss the meaning of *οἰκονομία*, whether there can be said to be such a science, and what is its subject matter. No possession is of any value unless the owner knows how to use it for his advantage; but with this knowledge even enemies may be turned to profit. Unbridled passions, however, reduce a man to a state of slavery, in which no wealth and no knowledge of its advantageous use will be of any service. In c. 2 Critobulus asserts his own freedom from this degrading condition, but desires to learn what course of action will conduce to the augmentation of his property. He expresses the suspicion that Socrates may think him sufficiently rich already. To his surprise, however, Socrates tells him that while he considers himself to be rich enough, though his whole property would be dear at five minae, he regards Critobulus as poor, though his estate would bring at least a hundred times as much. He calls Critobulus' attention to the many expenses his position as a rich man entails upon him. If Socrates should himself come to want, his friends would, with a trifling contribution, set him on his legs again with what would be for him an abundance. But Critobulus' friends are always looking for favors from him. So that Socrates feels a real concern for Critobulus, *μή τι ἀνήκεστον κακὸν πάθῃ καὶ εἰς πολλὴν ἀπορίαν καταστῇ*. This leads Critobulus to entreat Socrates to act as his guide to the acquisition of wealth. Socrates points out that this request seems an absurd one for Critobulus to make, who had but now laughed at him for his ignorance in representing himself as rich while the wealthy Critobulus was poor. But Critobulus retorts that Socrates knows at least one *πλουτηρὸν ἔργον*, viz. *περιουσίαν ποιεῖν*. If he is able so to husband his little as to have more than he wants, he must surely be able to make a larger store yield a more ample abundance. Socrates, after protesting that he has had no property of his own to handle with a view to increase, and has never had that of any other persons intrusted to him to make experiments with, says that the case is not yet hopeless for Critobulus; for he will indicate to Critobulus others far more capable than himself to give instruction in what he is so anxious to learn from him: *ἐγὼ τοίνυν σοι δείξω ὅσα νῦν λιπαρεῖς παρ' ἐμοῦ μαθάνειν πολὺ ἄλλους ἐμοῦ δεινότερους περὶ ταῦτα*. Socrates has, he confesses, had his attention strongly attracted by the fact that men who are engaged in the same lines of work pursue them with very different

results, some acquiring wealth and others falling into distress. On examining the cause of this surprising fact he was led to see that it came about quite naturally, *πάνυ οἰκείως*, and his observation had thus made him acquainted with the most conspicuous instances of successful enterprise in various departments to be found in the city: *ὁμολογῶ μεμεληχέναι μοι οἷτινες ἕκαστα ἐπιστημονέστατοί εἰσι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει*. From these Socrates is sure that Critobulus might learn to become an able money-getter: *παρ' ὧν ἂν καὶ σὲ οἶμαι, εἰ βούλοιο, μαθόντα, πάνυ ἂν δεινὸν χρηματιστὴν γενέσθαι*.

These words conclude the second chapter; I have quoted two or three lines of the Greek that it may be seen what it is Socrates undertakes to do. He has no practical knowledge of economical matters himself. He has, it is true, had his attention attracted by the variety in the fortunes of men engaged in the same enterprises; and the observation he has made has taught him in general that attention and care were rewarded by success and that negligent dealing brought its natural punishment with it, and has besides made him acquainted with the most successful practitioners in various walks of life. He offers to indicate these persons to Critobulus, whose wants would thus be supplied better than they could be supplied by Socrates himself. He does not undertake to give instruction himself, either immediately or mediately. The first three lines of c. 3, which Herr Lincke supposes to be genuine, are *Ἀκούσας ταῦτα ὁ Κριτόβουλος εἶπε, Νῦν τοι, ἔφη, ἐγὼ σε οὐκέτι ἀφήσω, ὦ Σώκρατες, πρὶν ἂν μοι ᾗ ὑπέσχησαι ἐναντίον τῶν φίλων τουτωνὶ ἀποδείξῃς*. In view of all that has preceded, these words can mean nothing else than that Critobulus insists that their present group shall not break up till Socrates has indicated the persons to whom Critobulus should apply for instruction. There is not, so far as I can see, a syllable which could justify Critobulus in calling for or expecting the performance of Socrates' promise in any other sense.

When we again come upon the genuine dialogue, according to Herr Lincke's text (c. 6, § 12 of the ordinary one), we find Socrates saying: *τί οὖν, ὦ Κριτόβουλε, ἦν σοι ἐξ ἀρχῆς διηγήσωμαι ὥς συνεγενόμην ποτὲ ἀνδρὶ θς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει εἶναι τῷ ὄντι τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐφ' οἷς τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα δικαίως ἐστὶν ὃ καλεῖται καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ*. Critobulus assents, and then we hear no more of him, the rest of the book being taken up with a report by Socrates of a conversation he had once had with a certain Ischomachus. Herr Lincke's account (p. 52) of c. 3, 1, following on Critobulus' demand for

immediate satisfaction is this, "und dieser beginnt denn . . . den belerenden Vortrag." And below he says that the second chapter contains the proof (1) that Critobulus needs instruction in good husbandry, and (2) "*auf welche Weise* Socrates ihm die Belerung werde erteilen können." I think that these expressions indicate the fundamental mistake made by Herr Lincke. There is not, as I have said, a syllable that implies a promise on the part of Socrates to communicate instruction either derived from his own experience or imparted to him by others. All that Socrates undertakes to do is to indicate persons among the citizens who, he is assured by his observation of their success, must be able to teach others to follow their example. Herr Lincke supposes that the report of the long conversation with Ischomachus is the fulfilment of Socrates' promise, and is therefore naturally surprised that between Critobulus' demand for the immediate performance of it and the discourse which he assumes to be its fulfilment, Socrates should coolly, and without any protest on the part of Critobulus, intercalate a long discussion about various points of good husbandry amounting to three chapters and a half. Herr Lincke repeats again (p. 54) his summary of the introduction, "lässt sich *das Versprechen des Socrates* etwa so formuliren: Socrates, dem die eigne Erfahrung in der Erwerbskunde abgeht, erklärt sich *zum Ersatz dafür* und unter Zustimmung des Kritobulos bereit, *ihm die nötige Belerung durch Schilderung musterhafter Männer aus Athen zu erteilen.*" I maintain on the contrary that there is not a word to show that Socrates promised to do anything else for Critobulus than to indicate to him citizens from whom he could learn if he chose. In c. 3, § 1 foll. (of the received text), Socrates says he can point out persons who spend much money on building their houses and yet find them inconvenient, while others with a much smaller outlay have houses with every needful convenience. Some again he can indicate whose possessions are practically of no use to them from the disorderly way in which they are kept, while others have the full advantage of everything they possess, because they can lay their hands on them when they want them. Again men differ in a corresponding way in the handling of their slaves, in the management of their farms, of their horses, of their wives. As Socrates goes over these six points he is made to use such phrases as ἐγὼ σε ἄξιω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου, σὺ δὲ θεώμενος δέηπου καταμαθήσει. Of course, as Herr Lincke denies the genuineness of these sections, I cannot refer to these expressions as evidence of Xenophon's own statement

of his purpose. But it must be admitted that the interpolator would have understood the first two chapters as well as Herr Lincke, and he could not have intended in his additions to represent the promise of Socrates as different from what it was stated to be in the second chapter. Herr Lincke, on the contrary, interpreting Socrates' intention as I have described, finds in this enumeration of six points of good and bad husbandry a complete abandonment by Socrates of his professed purpose.

At the end of c. 3 Socrates says that he can, if Critobulus pleases, indicate to him successful practitioners of other branches (*τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιστημῶν*). But, c. 4, 1, Critobulus says that it would be useless to point out to him the means of acquiring all; he merely desires that Socrates will indicate the best and the most suitable for *him*, and do what he can to help him by teaching him himself. Socrates then goes on to exclude from consideration the mechanical trades (*αἱ βαναυσικαί*), and when Critobulus asks him *ἡμῖν δὲ ποίαις συμβουλεύεις χρῆσθαι*, replies that they need not be ashamed to imitate the Persian king who is said to set the highest value on the arts of war and of agriculture. And the remainder of the fourth chapter is taken up with an account of the system by which the Persian arrangements conduce to the highest cultivation of the soil; and we have the story of the visit of Lysander to Cyrus the younger and the account of the prince's personal labors in his garden, which is translated by Cicero in his *Cato Major* (c. 17). At the beginning of c. 5, Socrates tells Critobulus that the reason of his narrating this story is that he might prove *ὅτι τῆς γεωργίας οὐδ' οἱ πάντοτε μακάριοι δύνανται ἀπέχεσθαι*. And he then proceeds to enumerate many of the advantages of an agricultural life, at the end of c. 5 insisting that it is as necessary to secure the favor of the gods for success in the cultivation of the ground as it is in warlike enterprises. In c. 6, Critobulus assents to this, but begs Socrates to return from his digression and pursue the subject of economy proper, as he thinks he has a clearer view now of the proper mode of life. Socrates then proposes that they should first review what they had so far agreed to, and this leads us to c. 6, § 12, where Herr Lincke allows that the genuine dialogue is continued. I shall give as briefly as I can the chief points of his criticism on these chapters, premising that I shall omit nothing which seems to me of greater weight than what I cite.

Herr Lincke objects (p. 57) that in these chapters we have an independent statement of Socrates' own views on various points of

good management and the most important occupations, notwithstanding his former refusal to give any instruction himself on the ground of ignorance of the subject (p. 57). "Ist es nicht ungeheimt, dass er trotz dieser Weigerung weiter docirt? Wie lächerlich ist die gedankenlose Anmasung, dass er unmittelbar nach seinem Geständnis über seine Unerfahrenheit in der Oekonomik nichts destoweniger seine eigne Meinung über wirtschaftliche Angelegenheiten an den Mann zu bringen sucht." On his remarks on the proper age for buying horses and their management, we are asked, "klingt das nicht wie Sachkenntnis und eigne Erfahrung?" I need make no remarks on Herr Lincke's apparent incapacity to appreciate the irony of Socrates.

Then he finds a similar contradiction (p. 58) in the allusion to the Persian king. Was it not the ἐπιστημονέστατοι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει from whom he has said that Critobulus could learn? After this, when Socrates says (4, 4) ἄρα μὴ αἰσχυρθῶμεν τὸν Περσῶν βασιλέα μιμήσασθαι, "diese Worte müssen jeden, der auf den Zusammenhang achtet, in gerechtes Erstaunen versetzen." If the author intended to make this reference to the Persian king, and to pronounce a panegyric on his arrangements, why did he direct attention so pointedly to Athenians? It is strange that Herr Lincke has not noticed here that the mention of the Persian king's attention to agriculture is introduced merely to show Critobulus that such attention is respectable: to prove that τῆς γεωργίας οὐδ' οἱ πάνυ μακάριοι δύνανται ἀπέχεσθαι (c. 5, 1). Whatever may be thought of some of the details of this episode, it is not in the smallest degree inconsistent with anything that has preceded it. It is impossible for me to follow in detail all that Herr Lincke alleges as to the want of coherence between what he assumes to have been Socrates' promise and the actual contents of these chapters. He uses the strongest expressions to do justice to his sense of incongruity: "passt-wiedie Faust aufs Auge" (p. 60): "so besteht denn in allem was die Form der Darstellung betrifft ein tiefgehender, schroffer Widerspruch zwischen der Erklärung die Socrates in der Einleitung gegeben hat und der hierauf unternommenen Behandlung des Themas" (p. 62). Socrates has taken the liberty of putting forward his own knowledge and to support it with unsuitable examples. Still we can see that the author of the interpolation has tried to disguise his handiwork by using expressions which may have the appearance "als stehe alles in gutem Zusammenhang." Herr Lincke then proceeds at great length to show how unsuited the doctrine expressed by

Socrates in these chapters is to the needs of Critobulus. We have been told in the first and second chapters that Critobulus needs instruction as to the use of his property so as to increase it: only to him who knows how to use his goods are they really χρήματα. But he is a householder. We learn from 1, 8-13, and also from 2, 11, that horses, land, sheep and money are the objects from which gain is made. "Auf Landbau, Viehzucht, Capitalanlage und ähnliche Dinge hat sich also die Belerung im gegebenen Falle zu richten—*aber auch zu beschränken*" (p. 63). We cannot, therefore, be surprised that Herr Lincke thinks that the description of the mixed agricultural and military arrangements of the Persians can have no instructive interest for Critobulus; therefore "es fehlt dem ganzen Abschnitt die organische Bestimmung" (p. 67). Wholly inappropriate and useless is the reference to Cyrus the younger, and the account of Lysander's visit to him. Critobulus can derive not the slightest benefit from this. It was of no use to hold up before him the example of Cyrus' personal labors in his garden, for he needs no such stimulus. His disposition has been already shown to be excellent. "Alles dies zeigt uns nicht Socrates als Lerer der Erwerbskunde, sondern ein Wirrkopf, der nicht weis was er seinem Zuhörer schuldig ist" (p. 69). Again, in regard to the details of the panegyric on agriculture in c. 5, Herr Lincke finds himself equally dissatisfied. In § 1 Socrates attributes to the exercise of it ἡδυπάθειά τις καὶ οἴκον αὐξήσεις καὶ σωμάτων ἀσκήσεις. But this order of treatment is not followed in the chapter; and besides other matters are intruded, as in § 3 the mention of the supply of material for sacrifice to the gods. "Es liegt auf der Hand, dass die Gaben des Landes, welche zu Opfern verwendet werden, nicht als Gegenstände des Genusses oder des Gewinnes für den Menschen aufzufassen sind" (p. 71). After pointing out more of such infelicities, he concludes: "das Ganze macht überhaupt von Anfang bis zu Ende den Eindruck einer Reihe schlecht geordneter und nicht immer treffender Einfälle" (p. 72). It is, he thinks, a prime fault of all this discourse that it contains no practical suggestions. The remarks of Socrates seem not to be addressed to Critobulus, who can derive no benefit from the bare assertion that agriculture procures much pleasure and profit: "es hat vielmer den Anschein, als sei die Absicht einem unerfahrenen jungen Manne, der nicht recht weis welche Beschäftigung er wol am besten ergreifen soll, Interesse für die Landwirthschaft einzuflößen" (p. 73). Herr Lincke here expresses, in my judgment, the exact truth; but whereas he con-

siders that a discourse of this character is self-condemned where it stands, with my view of the circumstances of the case it needs no justification.

Herr Lincke then has some remarks upon the recapitulation at the beginning of c. 6. It is not, I confess, as complete as one might expect, and it mentions one conclusion as having been reached which is not found in the previous chapters. But this difficulty has troubled all the commentators, who make various attempts to set matters straight. It is not, therefore, worth while to follow Herr Lincke in his discussion of the shortcomings of this passage, as he only differs from others in the greater minuteness of his examination and in the violence of his remedy. It is indeed remarkable that Herr Lincke in all his criticism, both of the ill-adjustment of the parts of the dialogue to each other and of shortcomings in regard to phraseology and syntax, appears never to think that a lighter remedy than total expulsion of the offending passage might be resorted to.

I must pass lightly over the rest of Herr Lincke's remarks on these chapters. As he has complained of their want of proper subordination to the beginning of the dialogue as he understands it, so he takes further offence at the fact that in some respects they anticipate the discourse of Ischomachus, which forms the latter portion of it. He thinks that no one can believe that Socrates would have delivered this pitiful cento of remarks while he had firm in his recollection the original and well ordered utterance of Ischomachus and intended presently to repeat it in full. But surely it is a perfectly natural supposition to imagine that Socrates may have had at first no intention of recounting his conversation with Ischomachus, and may have been led on by the interest of Critobulus to do more than he purposed. I do not think it is at all necessary to make this supposition; I only suggest it to call attention to the flimsy character of Herr Lincke's reasoning. Herr Lincke attacks particularly the remarks introduced about the Persian king. There is indeed in this passage one fault which it is quite impossible that Xenophon can have committed. After his speaking of Cyrus the elder, certain remarks are introduced about the younger Cyrus without any indication that the persons were different. This difficulty has, however, engaged the attention of the commentators before, and been variously dealt with. Schenkl thinks that two sections (18 and 19) are an interpolation (which they are exceedingly likely to be, as they contain two quotations with almost verbal

exactness from the *Anabasis*), and that when these crept into the text the context was mutilated and altered to suit them. But beyond this Herr Lincke thinks that Xenophon could never have represented Socrates, whom he must have heard discourse before he joined Cyrus' expedition in 401, as possessed of a knowledge of Persian customs which he himself only acquired during the Cyreian expedition; and he could not but feel how inadequate a guarantee for affairs in Persia Socrates must have seemed, who had hardly ever passed beyond the limits of his own country. But, says Herr Lincke, even granting that Xenophon might possibly have committed this absurdity of making Socrates pose as an authority on Persian matters, he certainly would not have represented him as uttering what was false and perverse. The ground of this attack is that in speaking of the officers in charge of the various duties of raising and dispensing the revenues, of controlling the troops, etc., the word *οἱ ἄρχοντες* is not used in one exclusive meaning. It is true that Cobet (N. L. p. 574) has bracketed this word twice, but merely, as he says, because "*sententiam onerat.*" Herr Lincke finds it intolerable that it should not have been used as the technical name of one grade of officers. He is also offended that Socrates is made to say that when these officers are found inefficient the king *παύων τῆς ἀρχῆς ἄλλους ἐπιμελητὰς καθίστησι*, because in *Cyr. VIII 1, 9*, Xenophon "*die ἐπιμεληταί als untergeordnete Beamte genannt und ihre Functionen definirt hat*" (p. 90). It is worth while to quote this passage from the *Cyropaedia* that we may see with what degree of precise definition of rank the word is used there. *Κυρος δ' ἐπὶ μὲν τὰλλα καθίστη ἄλλους ἐπιμελητὰς, καὶ ἦσαν αὐτῷ καὶ προσόδων ἀποδεκτῆρες καὶ δαπανημάτων δοτῆρες καὶ ἔργων ἐπιστάται καὶ κτημάτων φύλακες καὶ τῶν εἰς τὴν δίαίταν ἐπιτηδεύων ἐπιμεληταί· καὶ ἵππων δὲ καὶ κυνῶν ἐπιμελητὰς καθίστη οὓς ἐνόμιζε καὶ ταῦτα τὰ βροσκήματα βέλτιστ' ἂν παρέχειν αὐτῷ χρῆσθαι.* I think that no one, who had not a case to make out, would imagine that in these passages the words *ἄρχοντες* and *ἐπιμεληταί* were used in a technical sense at all. Herr Lincke himself refers to two passages in the *Cyropaedia* (*VIII 1, 6; 6, 14*) in which the term *ἄρχοντες* is used for *σατράπαι*, but only for the more certain establishment of his thesis here: for it seems he has in another treatise proved that these passages are also interpolations, the work, as he believes, of the same unprincipled grandson. He does not find it possible to describe, except in general terms, the motives which can have influenced this misguided youth thus to disfigure with his senseless

and clumsy interpolations the well adjusted scheme of Xenophon. He can say no more than that he "den Inhalt des Gespr ches durch allerlei Notizen zu bereichern und durch dialogisch-rhetorische Rede bungen zu versch nern gesucht hat" (p. 92). Xenophon, it seems, had had some influence over the young man's style. We can only regret that the moral training which, no doubt, he received had an effect on his subsequent conduct so much more feeble than could be desired.

I shall pass over without special remark the shorter interpolations which follow, which betray, according to Herr Lincke, either contradictions of what we find in the genuine book, or senseless repetitions for which the interpolator betrays "ebensoviel Vorliebe als Ungeschick" (p. 97). I must, however, say something about the last chapter (21), which is expunged entirely. The contents of this chapter are as follows: Socrates congratulates Ischomachus on his successful vindication of the merits of agriculture as a pursuit, * ς  δ τῇ ὑποθέσει ὅλον τὸν λόγον βοηθοῦντα παρέσχησαι*. Ischomachus replies that in every sort of activity the quality of aptness for command, *τὸ ἀρχικὸν εἶναι*, is that which most discriminates one man from another; and he illustrates this position by the different behavior and different influence of shipmasters and generals, as they are or are not fit for command. To the whole of this chapter, as well as to its details, Herr Lincke has serious objections to make. It has clearly undergone some hard usage at the hands of transcribers. This may be indicated by the fact that one passage is, as it stands, unintelligible, and that Cobet has made some ten suggestions of emendation in it. I shall confine myself, therefore, to Herr Lincke's objections to the matter of the chapter. He thinks the illustrations taken from commanders on land and at sea flat and trivial, and is sure that the interpolator borrowed from the Cyropaedia. *He can see no point in the remark that the well-managed crew come ashore reeking with sweat while the others land *ἀνιδρωπί*, because the sweat could be no advantage to the former nor the want of it punishment to the latter (p. 128). He cannot understand any reason why the lazy crew should hate the commander who has not succeeded in making them work. The disparagement of personal advantages and of distinguished excellence in military exercises, in comparison with the capacity to inspire courage and a spirit of obedience, appears to him "v llig sinnlos." He points to Anab. I 9, 5, where we are told that Cyrus the younger excelled in horsemanship and the use of arms; but he does not

refer to An. II 6, in which the merits of Clearchus as a commander are depicted, especially his ability *ἐμποιῆσαι τοῖς παροῦσιν ὡς πειστέον εἶη Κλεάρχῳ*, but not a word is said of his superiority in military exercises. All this shows, Herr Lincke thinks, that the author of the chapter was entirely destitute of warlike experience. "Der Verfasser war offenbar ohne militärisches Verständnis und kriegerische Erfahrung" (p. 128). He cannot understand how it can be possible that a master should be armed with full power of reward and punishment, and yet fail in making his dependents eager to do their best under his eye. What more can a master have? he asks. It is inconceivable that Ischomachus can have indicated an opposition between one governor so equipped with full powers and another who is able to inspire his subordinates with a desire to do their duty. "Mir scheint diese Annahme rein aus der Luft gegriffen und das durch den Gegensatz bezeichnete Verhältnis praktisch undenkbar" (p. 129). He thinks, moreover, that for Ischomachus, after he has in the genuine part of the dialogue described the way in which he himself secured obedience and hearty work from his people, to say here that the possession of such a power is *ἔχειν τι ἥθους βασιλικοῦ* would be "ein hässliches Selbstlob" (p. 126). And in general he finds the praise of this quality of capacity for rule altogether excessive. It was only *one* of the five qualities mentioned in cc. 12-15 as needed in the *ἐπίτροπος*, and why should it be here singled out and exalted above the knowledge of what has to be done, which is really the principal thing in agriculture as in everything else? Ischomachus has told us himself (13, 2) that a steward ignorant of what needed to be done would be as useless as a physician who should be regular in visiting his patients but should be unable to prescribe for them. Is it then conceivable that he should here at the end of the dialogue insist so strongly on the possession of a capacity for command? "Es ist kein passendes Schlusswort, sondern ein unnützes Anhängsel" (p. 125)? Now, in all this, which Herr Lincke thinks so foreign to what we might expect, Grote (Plato III, p. 571) finds the most characteristic traces of Xenophon's handiwork; and goes on to show how Xenophon's own experience must have turned his attention peculiarly to the difficulty of ensuring steady obedience from subordinates, and to the conditions by which such difficulty might be overcome. We see, therefore, that the very remarks which seem to Herr Lincke to betray a writer wholly without military experience, appear to Grote as the ripest fruit of lifelong observation of the conditions of success in the most important affairs.

The resource which a defender of the genuineness of the attacked passages would naturally resort to, of quoting expressions of similar sentiment from Xenophon's other writings, is in the present case hardly available. For it either turns out that Herr Lincke himself, or some one else working on the same critical lines, has proved the spuriousness of the passages one desires to cite; or that these passages are referred to as evidently the ones which the interpolator of the *Oeconomicus* had under his eye when he perpetrated his forgeries. Thus Herr Lincke discredits this 21st chapter on the ground that it is borrowed from the *Cyropaedia* (I 6, 20, 21; III 1, 20, 28; I 1, 6). It is indeed true that precisely the same sentiments are there expressed in different language. But if the passage in the *Oeconomicus* is to be discredited on this account, so must also considerable portions of *Anab.* I 9, be expunged for the same reason. To illustrate the minuteness of Herr Lincke's comparative method: he finds that the mention by Ischomachus (c. 9, 6), in his instruction to his wife as to the advantages of order and putting everything in its own place, of *ὑποδήματα γυναικεῖα, ὑποδήματα ἀνδρεῖα* was in the eye of the interpolator of *Cyr.* VIII 2, 5, where, among other instances of the division of labor in a great city we are told, *ἀλλ' ὑποδήματα ποιεῖ ὁ μὲν ἀνδρεῖα ὁ δὲ γυναικεῖα*. The advice of Ischomachus to his wife to abstain from the use of rouge and other means of making herself appear handsomer than nature had made her has, it seems, been utilized by the interpolator of *Cyr.* VIII 1, 40, in which we are told that Cyrus thought it worth while for himself and his great officers to impose by such artifices on the minds of the lower orders. On the other hand the illustration of the advantages and the beauty of good order from the movements of a chorus is genuine in the *Cyropaedia* (I 6, 18), and borrowed from it by the interpolator of the *Oeconomicus* (c. 8, 3).

I have now given, as I think, a fair account of Herr Lincke's arguments against the genuineness of portions of the *Oeconomicus*, so far as they are grounded on matter and arrangement. I now proceed to consider as briefly as I can his objections to the style and diction of the incriminated passages. Here again the natural mode of defending them is forestalled by Herr Lincke, who says that, inasmuch as it has been proved that the interpolator was a younger contemporary of Xenophon, and must have been in the most intimate relations with him, and have taken great pains to imitate him, it cannot surprise us to find a certain similarity between his diction and that of the genuine Xenophon. And he then proceeds

to enumerate some seventy-five words or expressions which are notably Xenophontian; and then he gives a shorter list of points of agreement, not with Xenophon himself, but with the Attic usage of the period. But the inference which an unwary reader might be disposed to draw from this similarity is rudely checked by the statement that in the interpolated passages altogether there are no less than fifty-seven words not elsewhere found in Xenophon. This seems at first sight a formidable fact; but the force of it is at once reduced by Herr Lincke himself who says, (*a*) that several of them are unobjectionable as being evidently the words required by the passages in which they occur; (*b*) that others are clearly formed on the analogy of Xenophontian words; (*c*) others are due to the subject of the digressions in which they occur, as *χωμῶδός*, *τραγῶδός*, *κύκλιος χορός*, *ἐμπλεῖν*, etc. But making all allowance for these deductions, the interpolator betrays a want of restraint which a good writer would not exhibit. In his criticism here Herr Lincke does not seem to recognize as one of the characteristics of Xenophon's diction a fondness for poetic and epic expressions, a remark which Cobet makes more than once. I just mention in the order in which they come a few of the words to which exception is taken: *ἀτερπής* (Thucyd.), *ἐδμήρεια* (poet. and Plat.), *σκιатραφεῖσθαι* (Hdt. and Plat.), *χαχοποιεῖν*, which occurs in Aesch., Aristoph., and also, I was going to say, in Xen. Mem. III 5, 26; but my petty triumph is at once wrested from me by the observation that Herr Lincke has himself noted this fact, but concludes that "es ist nur ein Beweis mer für die Unechtheit dieser Stelle"—*i. e.* of the Memorabilia (p. 143). The interpolator is inordinately fond of using compounds where a practised writer would have contented himself with the simple word, *e. g.* *ἀποιεῖν πρόσω*, which Eurip. has, and Thucyd. with *μακράν*: *καταπλουτίζειν*, *καταχερδαίνειν* (which last Cobet expressly justifies, N. L. p. 574, as here, required by the meaning), and others of the same character. He thinks that in hardly one is the preposition of any perceptible use, and is convinced that the employment of them is due merely to the desire to give an appearance of strength to the style. I have myself gone over with some care the genuine parts of the dialogue to see if they did not betray analogous phenomena with the interpolated ones. My conclusion is that on this ground there is no sort of reason for attributing them to a different author. I will only mention one or two points. In c. 9, 3, Ischomachus, speaking of the designed adaptation of various apartments in his house to the things they were to be

occupied by, uses the expression ὥστε αὐτὰ ἐκάλει τὰ πρέποντα ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ, and in the next paragraph he uses παρακαλεῖν in the same connection. The word χερσεύειν is used in c. 5, 17 (spurious), in the sense of 'to lie barren or waste.' And it appears to be used only by Xenophon and only in this book. Why then has not Herr Lincke mentioned it among his notes of forgery? I suggest that the reason may be that it occurs again in the same sense in the genuine chapter 16, 5.

After his criticism of the diction, Herr Lincke passes to the grammar. In no case, so far as I have observed, does he give the unfortunate writer the benefit of the supposition that he may have been misreported by his transcribers. It is just to these matters that Cobet has devoted thirty-three pages of his *Novae Lectiones*, his suggestions being distributed impartially over the genuine as well as the spurious portions. To take a single instance: we find in 21, 8, μέγας τῷ ὄντι οὗτος ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἂν—δύνηται, on which Herr Lincke notes the omission of the article with ἀνὴρ. But Cobet remarks, "loci artificiose compositi concinnitas postulat ut scribatur μέγας τῷ ὄντι οὗτος ἂν εἴη ὃς ἂν κ. τ. λ." Many of Herr Lincke's defects have been eliminated from the text by emendations as certain as this. Of others it may be said that, supposing them to be errors, they would have been as impossible to the assumed fabricator as to Xenophon himself, or as it would be to a well-educated American youth to write 'I was going to home,' unless he purposely violated what his ear must have told him was the correct rule. As a single instance: he points to ἐν τῷ ἄστυ in the spurious 5, 4, whereas in the genuine 11, 18 we have the normal εἰς ἄστυ without the article. Now, the use of ἄστυ without the article was either established or it was not. If the expressed article was so rigorously forbidden by usage that the use of it, as in the above passage, could not be defended by the immediately preceding and contrasted ἐν τῷ χώρῳ, then this usage must have been as much a matter of instinct with the supposed Xenophon the younger as it was with his grandfather, and the insertion of the article must be due to the ignorance of a copyist. Again Herr Lincke refers to the use of σύν and μετά. I am not sure that I quite understand him here. He finds in certain spurious sections the use of σύν to μετά as 5 : 2. But T. Mommsen has established that the ratio was as 2 : 1. We must therefore conclude that we have here a suspicious approximation to poetical language and not a correspondence with the usage of Xenophon. All such reasoning seems to me to the last degree hazardous. He

complains further that we find in 21, 7, ἐμποιῆσαι τοῖς στρατιώταις ἀκολουθητέον εἶναι instead of, as in Anab. II 6, 8, ὥς πειστέον εἶη, remarking that it was only by a degradation of meaning, similar to that of *efficere* from Cicero on, that ἐμποιεῖν could be used with the infinitive. This he thinks was not possible for Xenophon. But we find in 15, 1, which is genuine, ἐπειδὴν ἐμποιήσῃς τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι. As this stands in Lincke's text I can see no difference between it and the assailed construction of 21. It is true that here Schenkl, after Heindorf, inserts τὸ before ἐπιμελεῖσθαι; but this is apparently only to restore symmetry with a preceding clause, and not from any doubt as to the construction.

It is impossible in the great number of similar observations that Herr Lincke adduces to do more than pick out one here and there. His opinion is that the interpolator improved as he went on: "übrigens ist das 5te Capitel schon besser geschrieben als das 4te." But if one may form a judgment from the number of emendations Cobet has found desirable, the last chapter is the worst in the book.

As I have not wittingly left unmentioned any criticism of greater weight than those I have adduced, I think it must be admitted that the case made out by Herr Lincke is not a strong one. I recognize to the fullest extent the learning he has displayed and feel that the labor he has expended, if it had a more hopeful object, would deserve all praise. But I must be allowed to say that I consider we have in Herr Lincke's book a good specimen, only slightly exaggerated, of the kind of work on which an undue portion of German energy and German learning is expended. There seems to exist there a perfect mania for *athetesis*. Whether the existence of it is due in any degree to the demand for novelty in the subjects chosen for doctoral dissertations, I will not take upon me to decide. But it has, I think, certainly reached the proportions of a plague, and one which grows by what it feeds on. On this point Cobet remarks (Mnem. VII, p. 263), "ubi semel huiusmodi opinio (de falsitate librorum) subiit animum et quis suspiciosius tentat omnia an forte vitium sonent, facile reperiuntur quae eam suspicionem alant et confirment, unde tandem exoritur τὸ ἀδαμαντίνως πεπεῖσθαι, quod mentis aciem praestringit et occaecat." Herr Lincke believes that not the *Oeconomicus* alone, but also the *Memorabilia*, the *de venatione*, and in all probability the *Cyropaedia* were published not by Xenophon himself but by the heir who took charge of his literary remains; and he tells us it yet remains a task for criticism to undertake to ascertain, from the interpolations

which have been or are to be detected in these works and which all are doubtless of the same paternity, what was the literary capacity of the editor. This disease is unfortunately not confined to the Germans. It is sometimes taken in a virulent form by foreign students who are subjected to the same influence. I find, for instance, in a doctoral dissertation of a learned young American, which treats another famous author in a way analogous to Herr Lincke's dealing with the *Oeconomicus*, a protest against the *socordia* of the poor creature who maintains that what has hitherto passed as the genuine work of an author must be regarded as genuine till it has been proved to be spurious; and he then announces this statement: "gravior est eius culpa qui poetae famam obscurat unum spurium verum defendens quam eius qui illum duobus bonis et genuinis privat." I confess this doctrine appears to me portentous.

How different is this rule of criticism from that which is recommended by the veteran August Boeckh. The pages in which he discusses the principles of the higher criticism; the jealousy with which he guards the rights of an author to his own work; the cautious discrimination which he insists upon as the first duty of a scholar who undertakes to question the genuineness of a book or a passage, seem to me to embody a doctrine as unlike as possible to that I have just quoted; and the concluding words of one of his chapters appear to recommend the very opposite spirit in approaching such questions. "Wir müssen immer von der Tradition ausgehen und versuchen, ob sich die unverdächtigen positiven Zeugnisse für den Ursprung einer Schrift durch combinatorische Kritik bestätigen und vervollständigen lassen. Wo das Urteil irgend wie schwankend ist, gilt der Grundsatz: quivis praesumitur genuinus liber, donec demonstretur contrarium." Contrast these words with a dictum of the writer I have just quoted, "neque justus erga poetam est qui omnia genuina esse affirmat usquedum spuria demonstrantur." Can any two principles of procedure be more diametrically opposed to each other?

The genuineness of the 3d book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was also denied on similar grounds by Rose and others. On this proceeding L. Spengel remarks, "nam tertius liber, quem nostratium quidam et temere et inepte Aristotelis esse negant, si quis alius ingenuus philosophi nostri foetus est. V. Rose a discipulo tertium additum esse dicit, iam de universa hac rhetorica ab Aristotele profecta dubitat: haec est nostrae aetatis ars critica."

C. D. MORRIS.

V.—THE FOURTH PLAY IN THE TETRALOGY.

The recent¹ publication of a papyrus containing, among other things, a fragment of a lost play of Euripides, has led to a discussion of the question whether Euripides did not write dramas, or at least one drama, based upon occurrences of private life, to take the place of a satyr-drama. *À propos* of this discussion I purpose to investigate the nature and the metrical structure of the two extant dramas which occupy the fourth place in a tetralogy—the Cyclops² and the Alcestis.

I. The iambic trimeter of the satyr-drama proper, as exhibited in the Cyclops, presents nothing peculiar; that is to say, each of its features is found either in the tragic or in the comic trimeters. But it does not admit all the comic licenses, and yet certain portions of the play approach more nearly to the comic than to the tragic form. Other portions, however, conform rigorously to the tragic restrictions. For convenience, although they are well known to all, I shall briefly state the chief points in which the comic differs from the tragic trimeter. (1) Resolutions of the *θέσις* are not subject to the same limitations. (2) Elision and crasis³ are less restricted. (3) Comedy prefers liveliness, and hence does not allow quantity by the weak position. (4) It admits a (so-called) dactyl in the fifth place. (5) It admits the anapaest not only in the first place, but also in the next four places. (6) It frequently neglects caesura. (7) It disregards the Porsonic law. Let us now see how it is with the Cyclops. (1) Resolutions do not materially differ from those of the later Euripidean tragedy. (2) The same is true of elision and crasis. (3) Quantity by weak position is admitted, but more sparingly, perhaps, than in tragedy. (4) The dactyl is not tolerated in the fifth place. (5) The anapaest is sparingly employed in all the places but the last. This point demands a brief discussion. Disregarding the anapaest in the first

¹ For a notice of the papyrus, and the discussion based upon it, see the report of the Rheinisches Museum and the *Revue de Philologie* in this Journal, present number.

² In giving names of *plays*, I employ the Latin form; otherwise, I transcribe the Greek.

place and in proper names in any place (tragic privileges), we find from Dindorf's text the following results: (a) In the second place six instances of anapaest: vv. 272, 546, 562, 588, 647, 684. In v. 260 there was an instance of it which Heath removed. Dindorf accepts the emendation, and yet in his *De Metris Scenicorum* he counts this among the examples of anapaest *quae certa haberi possint*. The example also in v. 546 is by no means certain. Παριών, 'passing by,' for παρών, 'coming up' (a very familiar sense) is surely unnecessary. In v. 334 one reading gives an anapaest, but the passage is doubtful. (b) In the third foot we find only one example (v. 234), which should perhaps be removed by writing ἐξεφορῶντο for ἐξεφοροῦντο, as in Troad. 647, where occurs εἰσεφορούμεν. (c) In the fourth place occur five examples: vv. 154, 232, 558, 560, 566. Three of these are μὰ Δεῖ ἀλλ' (*bis*) and μὰ Δεῖ οὐ. (d) In the fifth place occur five examples: vv. 242, 274, 582, 637, 646. Now in the entire play there are 588 iambic trimeters. Of these, Odysseus, sustaining the reputation of χροτάλον, utters 232. For a reason given below I leave these out of the count. Omitting only the example in v. 260—the only example in a speech of Odysseus—I here present a comparative view of the remaining 356 trimeters and the first 356 trimeters of Aristoph. *Aves*:

	Anapaest in 2nd,	3rd,	4th,	5th.	Dactyl in 5th.
Cyclops	...	6,	1,	5,	...
Aves	...	55,	9,	16,	10

It is needless to comment on this disparity.

(6) The comic verse frequently dispenses with main caesura. In the Cyclops, on the contrary, there is no trimeter without a main caesura of some sort or other. As this proposition may seem bold, I shall examine all the apparent instances of neglected caesura.¹

¹ In Dindorf's text we find:

- (a) 9: οὐ μὰ Δεῖ, ἐπεὶ καὶ σκῦλ' | ἔδειξα Βακχίῳ
 32: καὶ νῦν τὰ προσταχθέντ' | ἀναγκαίως ἔχει
 94: ἀλλ' ἥσυχαι γίγνεσθ', | ἵν' ἐκπυθώμεθα
 229: ὑπὸ τοῦ; τίς ἐς σὸν κράτ' | ἐπύκτευσεν, γέρον
 252: ἄλλοι πρὸς ἄντρα ταῦτ' | ἀφίκοντο ξένοι
 288: μὴ τλῆς πρὸς ἄντρα ταῦτ' | ἀφιγμένους ξένους
 304: ἄλκις δὲ Πριάμον γαῖ' | ἐχέρωσ' Ἑλλάδα
 321: οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι Ζεὺς ἐστ' | ἐμοῦ κρείσσων θεός
 423: καὶ δὴ πρὸς ὧδας εἶπ'· | ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεγχείων
 427: σιγῇ, σὲ σῶσαι κἀμ', | εἰδὼ βούλη, θέλω
 450: πῶς θαί; σοφὸν τοί σ' ὄντ' | ἀκούομεν πάλαι

(a) In all the eighteen examples of the first group (a) in the foot-note, we have diaeresis with elision at the end of the third foot, *i. e. quasi-caesura*. I have shown in an article on Elision, Transactions Am. Phil. Assoc. for 1879, that *quasi-caesura* must be recognized as a valid substitute for main caesura.

(b) In the next group (b) it will be observed that there is a caesura in the third foot and also diaeresis at its end, the sense seeming to indicate the diaeresis as the place for a pause. But the *θέσις* of the third foot is in every instance resolved. Now, the effect of a resolved *θέσις* is almost to force the reciter to pass quickly on to the next foot; and, although a punctuation point sometimes immediately follows, the sense does not demand an actual pause, but sometimes rather the contrary, as in v. 28, *νέα νέοι*, and in v. 203, *τί τάδε; τίς ἡ ῥαθυμία*; In this verse all the points lose their pause in the same way. Whether this explanation appears satisfactory or not, the phenomenon is a common one in the tragedies of Euripides, where a verse entirely without main caesura is almost unknown. In such verses the caesura is not a pause at all, but serves as a *vinculum* to hold the two members

- 545: τί δῆτα τὸν κρατῆρ' | ὀπισθὲ μὲν τίθης
 555: ναὶ μὰ Δῖ', ἐπεὶ μοῦ φησ' | ἐρᾶν ὄντος καλοῦ
 561: ἀπομυκτέον δὲ σοὶ γ', | ὅπως λήψει πιεῖν
 586: ναὶ μὰ Δῖ', ὃν ἀρπάζω γ' | ἐγὼ 'κ τοῦ Δαρδάνου
 600: λαμπρὸν πυρώσας ὁμῶς | ἀπαλλάχθηθ' ἀπαξ
 668: σταθεὶς φάραγγος τῆσδ' | ἐναρμόσω χέρας
- (b) 6: ἐνδέξιός σφ' | ποδὶ παρασπιστῆς γεγώς
 28: νέμονται μῆλα | νέα νέοι πεφυκότες
 88: τεύχη φέρουσι | κενὰ, βορᾶς κεχηρμένοι
 99: τί χρῆμα; Βρομίον | πόλιν εὐοίμεν ἐσβαλεῖν
 160: χάλα τὸν ἄσκον | μόνον· ἔα τὸ χρυσίον
 203: ἀνεχε, παρέχε, τί | τάδε; τίς ἡ ῥαθυμία
 343: πῦρ καὶ πατρῶον | τόδε λέβητά θ' ὅς τις ζέσας
 549: Οὐτὶν· χάριν δὲ | τίνα λαβὼν σ' ἐπαινέσω
 577: ὥς ἐξένενσα | μόγις· ἄκρατος ἡ χάρις
 695: εἰ μὴ σ' ἐταίρων | φόνον ἐτιμωρησάμην
 700: πολλὴν θαλάσση | χρόνον ἐναιωρούμενον
- (c) 11: ἐπεὶ γὰρ Ἦρα | σοὶ γένος Τυρσηνικόν
 182: τὴν προδοτὴν ἢ τοὺς | θυλάκους τοὺς ποικίλους
 213: καὶ τὰστρο καὶ τὸν | Ὀρίωνα δέρκομαι
 250: τὰ καινὰ γ' ἐκ τῶν | ἡθάδων, ὧ δέσποτα
 261: ΣΕ. ἐγὼ; κακῶς γὰρ | ἐξόλοι'.
 ΟΔ. εἰ ψεύδομαι
 341: οὐ παύσομαι δρῶν | εὖ κατεσθίων τε σέ
- (d) 7: Ἐγκέλαδον ἱτέαν μέσην θενῶν δορί.

of the verse together. (See article on Caesura, Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1879.)

(c) The examples in the third group (c) are like those in the second, in so far as the caesura is not a pause; but there is no diaeresis in the middle of the verse, and so the resolved *θείεις* is not necessary. In the paper on Caesura just referred to I have shown that caesura between the article and its noun, as in vv. 182, 213, 250, is much better than no caesura at all. But it is extremely rare when the article, especially in a proclitic form, immediately precedes its noun. But that even then the caesura is of some value is shown by the fact that the article even in a proclitic form may stand at the end of a verse when its noun is at the beginning of the next, as Philoct. 263-4:

. . . Φιλοκτήτης, ὃν οἱ
δισσοὶ σιρατηγοὶ κτέ.

So other proclitics, as *εἰ* (Oed. Col. 993, Trach. 462), and *ὥς* (Oed. Col. 1130, S. Elect. 1309) may stand at the verse end. I have also shown that caesura may fall before an enclitic as in v. 11; and many examples may be produced where we should even expect a pause before an enclitic, whether at caesura or not, one instance occurring in this play, v. 676:

ὁ ξένος, ἴν' ὀρθῶς ἐκμάθῃς, μ' ἀπώλεσεν.

When *εἶ* is placed after the word which it modifies, as in v. 341, it must be read with a certain emphasis which causes a slight suspense just before it, and the caesura at that point is found occasionally in tragedy (see Aesch. Theb. 375, Suppl. 454, Agam. 934, Eumen. 87; Soph. Ajax 18, 95, 1252, Antig. 166, 723, Oed. Rex 626, 1066, Oed. Col. 1489, Philoct. 503; Eur. Hippol. 313, Hec. 253, Bacch. 49, Frag. 284, v. 16, 611).

(d) Finally, v. 7, as it appears in Dindorf's text, is entirely without caesura. But in the MSS. it is:

Ἐγξέλαδον ἰτέαν | ἐς μέσσην θενὼν ὁρί.

Elmsley first omitted *ἐς*, for what reason I do not know. I see no difficulty in the preposition on its own account; in fact we have the same use of it elsewhere, as in Aristoph. Nub. 549: *Κλέων' ἔπαισ' ἐς τὴν γαστέρα* —; and *metrically* there is no trouble, for Euripides would not hesitate to allow Seilenos to make synizesis in *ἰτέαν*. If it were necessary, I should prefer to read *εἰ* short (considering the relationship of *ἰτέα* to *ἴτους*); but there is no occasion for this.

I think I have shown that there is no verse in the Cyclops absolutely without main caesura, that is, no such verse as Aves 200:

ἐδίδαξα τὴν φωνὴν ξυὼν πολλὸν χρόνον,

which is a very common thing in comedy. *But the tragic licenses are more frequent than in tragedy itself.*

(7) No attention whatever is paid to the Porsonic law in comedy. In the Cyclops we find only the following exceptions: 120: οὐδεις | οὐδενός; 210: ὁμῶν | τῷ ξύλῳ; 304: ἐχάρωσ' | Ἑλλάδα; 331: οὐδέν | μοι μέλει; 639: οὐκ οἶδ' | ἐξ ὅτου; 664: . . . μέλπε μοι τόνδ', | ὦ Κύκλωψ; 672: οὐδεις σ' | ἡδίκει; 681: ποτέρας | τῆς χερός; 682: αὐτῇ | τῇ πέτρα—nine in all. The break after οὐδεις and οὐδέν, as in 120, 331, is found in tragedy. The one in 331 is excused also by the enclitic. In 304, 639, 664, 672, the offense is mitigated by elision. The only full violations are in vv. 681 and 682. Only one example (v. 304) occurs in any speech of Odysseus, and it is one of those excused by elision,—an influence of elision not by any means unknown to tragedy. (See my paper on Elision above referred to.)

It has been repeatedly pointed out that in the more serious portions of the satyr-drama the metre assumes the tragic form. This and more is true. The somewhat refined characters (there is only one such in the Cyclops) employ under *all* circumstances the tragic form. Odysseus in no instance, if Heath's emendation of v. 260 is accepted, disregards the restrictions of tragedy. (And, by the way, v. 260 occurs in a serious scene.) *Hence we see that a fragment's presenting the tragic form is no proof that it belongs to a tragedy.*

II. The Alcestis, not only according to ancient testimony, but also as is shown by internal evidence, occupied the fourth place in a tetralogy. It is, however, composed in the pure tragic metre throughout. *But this does not make it a tragedy.* There is not a passage in it (with one barely possible exception) of so comic a character that it would, even had it been in the Cyclops, have admitted any comic license. The characters are all of a serious and elevated order with the exception of one,—Herakles; and he combines two opposite qualities. The nobler quality predominates in all the scenes in which he appears, except where he discourses to the servant on the brevity and uncertainty of human life and fortunes; and also here *he* means to be serious. Even when he says,

δεῦρ' ἔλθ', ὅπως ἂν καὶ σοφώτερος γένη,

he was no doubt as much surprised, as the spectators were amused, at the terror of the trembling servant. But even if Herakles had meant to be comic, Euripides would hardly have lent him the aid of comic metre, when all the rest of the play was tragic in form. The air of refinement, therefore, which envelops the characters and pervades the whole story excluded the comic structure from this play. *But did this tone of refinement make the play a tragedy?* Here again I must answer in the negative. Weil, in his discussion of the new fragment, says (*Revue de Philologie*, 1880, p. 4): "Dans l'*Alceste* l'élément tragique domine, l'héroïne est le modèle du plus noble dévouement conjugal: c'est une tragédie, et le chœur, qui partout donne le ton à la pièce et en établit le milieu moral, ne ressemble en rien à un chœur de satyres," etc. But he certainly does not use the word 'tragedy' in its strict sense. I repeat, it is *not* a tragedy, nor is it to be judged and criticised as a tragedy. The tragic element, apart from the style, which is adapted to the characters, is fully as great and in one particular much greater in the Cyclops. In fact the satyr-drama is a modification of the antique tragedy. In this play Odysseus, emerging from the loathsome den of Polyphemos, describes the dire preparations made by the one-eyed monster, and continues:

And when the God-detested cook of Hell
Had all things ready, of my comrades, twain
He seized and slaughtered in a sort of rhythm,
The one into a cauldron's brazen gulf;
The other grasping quickly by the heel,
His head he dashed against the rocky cliff's
Projecting point, and scattered forth his brains;
And laying to with greedy knife, the flesh
He puts to roast upon the fire; the limbs
He casts into the cauldron's seething pool.

Then follows the description of a hideously repulsive scene, from which the poet brings us back to the ordinary current of the action through an account of the plans laid by Odysseus for the destruction of the monster. Now, in respect to this tragic element, what are the differences between this play and the *Alceste*? Simply these: In the Cyclops the tragic element is *really* tragic, but loses much of its effect, partly because it concerns persons who are secondary in the play and take no part in the dialogue; and partly from the fact that, *first*, all the spectators were already familiar with the calamity, since it is detailed in the *Odyssey*; and, *secondly*, the

approaching catastrophe is not elaborated, but is simply narrated in a single speech. In the *Alkestis*, on the other hand, the tragic element concerns the heroine herself, and the calamity is gradually approached, and the elaboration would inevitably produce a deep tragic effect but for the fact that the catastrophe is virtually *unreal*: the spectators *have already been notified that the death is not to be final*, in other words, that as far as all parties are concerned, *Alkestis* is only going to *appear* to die; that misunderstood and much abused prologue,—that absolute essential to the proper working of the play,—enables us calmly to look upon what is to us nothing more than a swoon mistaken for death. Let it not be understood that I am claiming perfection for Euripides; but I do insist upon it that great injustice is done Euripides in the prevalent manner of criticising the *Alkestis*. If there is a jar in the play it is *not* because the Heraklean scene is too comic for a tragedy, but because the elaboration of the seeming death of *Alkestis* is too tragic for a romance drama, replacing the satyr-drama, and designed to relieve the long strain of a tragic trilogy. But, as I have already shown, the prologue prevents, or is calculated to prevent, this over-tragic effect.

The fragments of satyr-dramas of Euripides in Dindorf's edition amount to about seventy-four iambic trimeters. One of these fragments (from the *Autolycus*) contains twenty-eight verses, the metre of which is strictly tragic. One verse (23) wants the caesura, but just this verse happens to be *ex coniectura Musuri*! In the remaining forty-six verses there is no departure from tragic rigor in the metre. The fragments of Sophocles and Aischylos are too meagre to discuss.

My object was primarily to discuss, as an independent theme, the metrical form and the nature of the two extant dramas which occupy the fourth place in a tetralogy; and, secondarily, thereby to place especially the metrical construction of the *Cyclops* in such a light as to prevent the drawing of hasty conclusions from the metrical form of the new fragment. But as some of the readers of this Journal may not otherwise have access to a copy of the fragment, I give it in full, and add a few remarks.

ὦ πάτερ, ἐχρῆν μὲν, οὗς ἐγὼ λόγους λέγω
 τοὺς λέγειν σέ· καὶ γὰρ ἀρμόζει φρονεῖν
 σὲ μᾶλλον ἢ μὲ καὶ λέγειν ὅπου τι δεῖ.
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἀφῆκας, λοιπὸν ἐστ' ἴσως ἐμὲ
 ἐκ τῆς ἀνάγκης τά γε δίκαι' αὐτὴν λέγειν.

Ἐκεῖνος εἰ μὲν μείζον ἡδίκηκέ τι
 οὐκ ἐμὲ προσήκει λαμβάνειν τούτων δίκην·
 εἰ δ' εἰς ἐμ' ἡμάρτηκεν, αἰσθῆσθαι με δεῖ.
 ἀλλ' ἀγνοῶ δὴ τυχὸν ἰσως ἄφρων ἐγὼ
 οὐς, οὐκ ἂν ἀντείπαιμι· καίτοι γ', ὦ πάτερ,
 εἰ τάλλα κρίνειν ἐστὶν ἀνόητον γυνή,
 περὶ τῶν γ' ἐαυτῆς πραγμάτων ἰσως φρονεῖ.
 Ἔστω δ' ὁ βούλει· τοῦτο τί μ' ἀδικεῖ λέγε.
 ἐστ' ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ κείμενος νόμος,
 τῷ μὲν διὰ τέλους ἦν ἔχει στέργειν αἰεὶ,
 τῇ δ' ὅς' ἂν ἀρέσκει τάνδρῳ, ταῦτ' αὐτὴν ποιεῖν.
 γέγονεν ἐκεῖνος εἰς ἐμ' οἷον ἡξίου,
 ἐμοὶ τ' ἀρέσκει πάνθ' ἃ κἀκεῖνῳ, πάτερ.
 Ἀλλ' ἐστ' ἐμοὶ μὲν χρηστὸς, ἡπόρηκε δέ·
 σὺ δ' ἀνδρὶ μ', ὥς φῆς, ἐκδίδως νῦν πλουσίῳ,
 ἵνα μὴ καταζῷ τὸν βίον λυπουμένη.
 καὶ ποῦ τοσαῦτα χρήματ' ἐστίν, ὦ πάτερ,
 ἃ μᾶλλον ἀνδρὸς εὐφρανεῖ παρόντα με;
 ἢ πῶς δικάϊον ἐστὶν ἢ καλῶς ἔχον,
 τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν με τὸ μέρος ὧν εἶχεν λαβεῖν,
 τοῦ συναπορηθῆναι δὲ μὴ λαβεῖν μέρος;
 Φέρ' ἦν δ' ὁ νῦν αὖ λαμβάνειν μέλλων μ' ἀνὴρ
 (ὃ μὴ γένοιτο, Ζεῦ φίλ', οὐδ' ἐσται ποτέ,
 οὐκ οὖν θελοῦσης οὐδὲ δυναμένης ἐμοῦ)
 ἦν οὗτος αὐτῆς ἀποβάλλῃ τὴν οὐσίαν,
 ἐτέρῳ με δώσεις ἀνδρὶ; καὶ τ', εἰ μὴ πάλιν
 ἐκεῖνος, ἐτέρῳ; μέχρι πόσον τὴν τῆς τύχης
 πάτερ, σὺ λήψει πείραν ἐν τῷμῳ βίῳ;
 Ὅτ' ἦν ἐγὼ παῖς, τότε σ' ἐχρῆν ζητεῖν ἐμοὶ
 ἀνδρ' ὃ μὲ δώσεις· σὴ γὰρ ἦν τόθ' αἰρεσις·
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἅπαξ ἔδωκας, ἡδὴ 'στὶν, πάτερ,
 ἐμὸν σκοπεῖν τοῦτ'· εἰκότως· μὴ γὰρ καλῶς
 κρίνας' ἐμαντῆς τὸν ἰδίον βλάβῳ βίον.
 Ταῦτ' ἐστίν· ὥστε μὴ με, πρὸς τῆς Ἑστίας,
 ἀποστερήσης ἀνδρὸς ὃ συνώκισας·
 χάριν δukaίαν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, πάτερ,
 αἰτῶ σε ταύτην· εἰ δὲ μὴ, σὺ μὲν βίᾳ
 πράξεις ἃ βούλει, τὴν δ' ἐμὴν ἐγὼ τύχην
 πειράσομ' ὥς δεῖ, μὴ μετ' αἰσχύνῃς, φέρειν.

I shall give MSS. readings for only a few passages.

8: Blass writes μ ἔδει. 13 is wanting in B, because of similar beginning in 14. Blass retains Weil's first reading: τοῦτο, τί μ' ἀδικεῖ, λέγε. After I had rejected the commas, I found that Cobet had done the same, and Weil had accepted the improvement. 20: ἐκδίδως in both copies, which Blass retains. 27: φερεαυν . . (blot)

λαμβ A; (blot) ερεσαν (blot) υν. λανβ B; φέρ', ἦν ὁ νῦν δὲ λαμβ Blass; φέρ', ἦν δὲ νῦν ὁ λαμβ Weil, who objects to Blass's position of δέ. But Weil's main caesura after proclitic form of article is to be avoided if possible; hence I have proposed the reading given in the text. Φέρ', ἦν δ' ὁ καὶ νῦν would be possible, but the MSS. seem to require something between νῦν and λαμβ. I have also thought of φέρ', ἦν δ' ὁ νῦν γε, and φέρ', ἦν δ' ὁ νῦν με, omitting μ' before ἀνήρ. This last is also Cobet's reading, but it is somewhat violent. The prosaic character of the passage almost justifies φέρ' ἦν δ' ὁ νυν. 33: πατερδελημψει A; πατερτελημψει B; πάτερ δὲ λήψει Blass, which Weil (in my opinion, properly) rejects, and writes σὺ. Still it must be admitted that this is a violent emendation. 42: I have written the semicolon instead of the period of Weil and Blass, and in 43 the comma instead of a semicolon. The last line I have left unchanged, but I have no doubt that Euripides wrote πειράσομαι δὴ κτέ, which was already changed in the original of our copyists.

It will be observed that this fragment is what may be called metrical prose. No passage of the same length in any extant drama of Euripides or his fellow tragedians is so absolutely void of poetical expressions. Cobet, calling attention to this, advances the theory that the fragment belongs to a *popular drama*, based upon occurrences of private life, taking the place, and possibly in some scenes approximating the tone, of a satyr-drama. Weil thinks that the play could hardly have been of the precise nature proposed by Cobet, and also that it must be sought among the plays of Euripides known to us by name. He then expresses the opinion that it must have been a real tragedy. He shows that Attic law did not give a father power to annul the marriage of a daughter, and concludes that the father in this case was exercising some other authority, viz. that of king. Further, he maintains that in v. 6 allusion is made to some political offense, from which he infers that the parties were not private individuals. And, finally, in the last verse he sees a dark intimation that the faithful wife will take her own life rather than abandon her husband; and such a resolution, he thinks, would be suitable only for a tragedy proper. But even if we admit his premises, could it not after all be a romance drama? May not some *deus ex machina* appear at the opportune moment? At any rate, to me there is about the fragment an air of romance rather than of tragedy. That the fragment belongs to Euripides cannot reasonably be doubted, as the general structure of the verse corroborates the Εὐριπίδου placed at the head. This

structure, at any rate, forbids the idea of a comedy, but *does not* exclude the possibility of a lively romance. As to a satyr-drama proper, *the metre does not render it impossible*, but the subject matter puts such a supposition almost out of the question. But I think I may go further, and say that some special licenses of the verse, as it stands, almost, if not quite, *exclude the idea of a tragedy proper*. In v. 10 we have violation of Porsonic law excused by elision; in 9 we have incision in the middle excused by preceding resolution; and in 18 there is quasi-caesura. All these occur in tragedy, but it would be difficult to find 44 consecutive verses containing all these licenses. And when we combine them with the elision in the last verse, the accumulation becomes entirely too great. But, as intimated above, I do not believe that Euripides made that elision at all, whether it be a tragedy, a romance drama, or a satyr-drama. This being removed, it would be impossible for the other licenses to occur in a Euripidean tragedy written after Ol. 89. Weil attributes the fragment to the *Temenidae*, and briefly discusses the difficulties that surround this theory. Various other theories have been advanced, but the location of the fragment is a question which I must leave entirely to those who have access to the necessary apparatus.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

NOTES.

THE SO-CALLED "SUBJONCTIF DUBITATIF," *JE NE SACHE PAS*, IN THE PRINCIPAL CLAUSE.

I believe almost any one would feel a little surprised on meeting, for the first time, the expression *je ne sache rien de si beau*, where one would expect *je ne sais rien de si beau*, which, by the way, does occur as frequently as the former. The surprise is no less great when, on turning to the French grammarians for an explanation of the anomaly, one finds them indulging in so much ingenious twaddle in defense of the expression as a subjunctive. The peculiarity of the construction has naturally called forth a great deal of discussion. It is confined to the first person singular of the verb *savoir*, and is always accompanied by a negation. Those who defend it as a subjunctive construction reason over it somewhat as follows: In saying *je ne sache rien de si beau*, the speaker feels and modestly admits that all objects which may be termed beautiful are not present to his mind, are not known to him, and hence he avoids expressing his opinion in a too direct way, but gives a doubting turn to the thought. It is a delicate, urbane mode of assertion, and can only be used when a man advances his own opinion. This accounts for its occurring only with a negative; for you can not say *je sache quelque chose de beau*. The expression, it is maintained, always implies a certain amount of hesitation in the mind of the speaker, and this can only be rendered by the mood of the verb most suited to represent this delicate nuance between positive affirmation and doubt. According to Boniface this use of the subjunctive is purely one of euphemism, and Bescherelle is of the same opinion. The latter says: "En effet, *je ne sache pas* est une expression dubitative et en quelque sorte palliative, qui affaiblit l'opinion qu'on émet, et qui lui ôte ce qu'elle pourrait avoir de trop décisif ou absolu." This may be made plain by an analysis of the sentence of Buffon: *je ne sache pas qu'il y ait eu des hommes blancs devenus noirs*. This means: *Il est possible qu'il y ait eu*

des hommes blancs devenus noirs, mais le hasard veut que je ne le sache pas.

Littre thinks the construction sprang up in the sixteenth century, and conjectures that those who first employed it had in their minds or understood some such expression as *j'ose dire*, the custom then being to construct *dire* with the subjunctive whenever the affirmation was not absolute. It may be remarked that this statement of Mr. Littre is purely conjectural, there being nothing to support it other than that *je ne sache pas* was current at that time. Nothing is easier than to get up fine-spun theories to explain grammatical anomalies, and if we accepted these theories the trade of the grammarian would soon come to grief for want of material to work on.

The explanation I would offer is not, I think, a mere theory, but a possible and probable fact; for while the evidence I bring forward in support of my case is rather *à priori* than empirical, it seems, nevertheless, sufficiently strong for purposes of proof. What I expect to show is this: that, for phonetical and other reasons, there is no necessity for regarding *sache* in *je ne sache pas* as a subjunctive.

In the first place, the fact that it is a single isolated expression, in which the subjunctive of no other verb of synonymous meaning can be substituted, is of itself sufficiently suspicious. You can not, for instance, say: *je ne croie pas qu'il y ait rien de si beau*; and if you used *pense* you would not regard it as subjunctive, though identical in form with the subjunctive. In the use of moods and tenses, at least in all the languages with which I am acquainted, there is always underlying the usage a general law or principle, which is applicable not to a single verb in a single form, but to a certain number or class of verbs. No such general principle is adducible in this case. It is unique and stands alone. To say that it is a doubting and polite form of assertion, or as Bescherelle, with all the pride of a Frenchman, states, "*une des nombreuses délicatesses de notre langue*," is lacking in point; for by using the subjunctive in the following clause, sufficient indirectness or *délicatesse* may be secured to express all the modesty of feeling of any person, however retiring and unassuming. Indeed, the subjunctive following *verba sentiendi et declarandi* is the only way, in the case of all the other verbs in the language, of rendering this feeling. For example, if I wished to make a modest assertion with reference to my disbelief in the spiritistic phenomenon of talking tables, I should say: *Je ne crois pas qu'il y ait des tables parlantes*; but if

I desired to be very positive in the expression of my opinion, or show that I had no doubt whatever about the matter, I should vary the form of my thought.

The uniqueness then of the construction, *je ne sache pas*, etc., led me to question its being a subjunctive; and somewhat to my chagrin, when consulting the grammatical and lexicographical authorities, I found I had been anticipated in my proposition to regard it as an indicative. I was reassured, however, on ascertaining that, while it had been proposed to treat it as an indicative, there was no serious attempt made to account for the form. Littré dismisses it with the assertion that *sache* from *sapio* is phonetically impossible. I maintain that it is not only possible but is also what ought to be expected. The form *sache* of the subjunctive is obtained from *sapiam*, through the influence of the palatal *i* in the latter. There can be no doubt of this, and the Provençal forms, *sapcha*, *sabcha*, show the process of derivation. Phonetic decay being much more rapid in French than in Provençal, the French lost the lip-sound at a very early date, anterior probably to the time of its becoming a written language. In *sapio* we have very nearly the same elements as in *sapiam*, and both will give *sache* by the same process of transformation; for although it may be contended that the strong vowel *a* in the syllable *-pam* gives it a greater chance to survive under a new form than can be claimed for the final *-pio* (*a* in end-syllables being usually preserved as *e*, whereas other vowels with their neighboring consonants are generally lost: *e. g.* *malignam*, *malignum*, *maligne*, *malin*); still *sache* from *sapio* does not stand alone as a phonetic phenomenon; for we have precisely the same mode of formation in *proche* from *propius* and *reproche* from *repropium*. Similar examples of this mode of formation may be found; so that I can not conceive what Mr. Littré means by saying that *sache* is not derivable from *sapio*. I should be curious to know how he defends this assertion. Not only is *sache* perfectly justifiable as a legitimately derived indicative form, but also there are strong reasons for believing that the whole tense, containing the same root, was at one time in use; although phonetically we could only account for the first person singular and the third person plural. But this latter does not prove a serious difficulty. There is a large number of verbs, a part of the forms of whose indicative present can not be explained by the regular laws of phonetic change. These irregular forms can only be accounted for by assuming that they originated through the influ-

ence of the present-participial and present subjunctive roots. The 1st, 2d, and 3d persons plural of *craindre* can not be obtained from the corresponding Latin forms; they must have been brought about by the analogy of *craignant* and *que je craigne, que tu craignes*, etc., *i. e.* by a feeling that the root of all the present tenses should be the same. In the earlier stages of the language this was more observable than at the present day.

I would infer, then, that the earliest inflexion of the present indicative of *savoir* was somewhat as follows: *je sache, tu saches, il sacht, nous sachons, vous sachez, ils sachent*, these forms being derived in accordance with the process above indicated; whereas the inflexion now in use was of later development and came directly from the French infinitive *savoir*. This double inflexion of certain tenses was not at all infrequent in old French. Even to-day we have the survival of two modes of inflexion for the verb *s'asseoir*, namely, *je m'assieds, tu t'assieds*, etc., and *je m'assois, tu t'assois*, etc., and two present participles (*asseyant* and *assoyant*), as well as two imperfects, two futures and two present subjunctives. What forms of the simple verb *seoir* still remain follow the older development (*il sied, il siéra*, etc.), while *surseoir* has preserved only the later inflexion. It seems a little strange that in this struggle for existence, to borrow the nomenclature of the biologists, the later or French creations did not crowd out the earlier. This is hardly in consonance with the usual fate of words, but it remains a fact notwithstanding. With reference to the two present participles of *savoir*, it is especially surprising that the older, *sachant*, should have maintained its place as a participle, while the younger, *savant*, did not, as a participle, survive the 16th century, Rabelais being one of the last writers to use it as such (*Phaëton ne sçavant ensuyvre la line ecliptique varia son chemin*, etc., *Pant. II, 2*).

To return to what I have assumed to be the primitive inflexion of the present tense of *savoir*. It has been shown that those forms which were not possible from the original derivative elements were legitimated by analogy from certain co-related forms; there is another method of strengthening this position, which it may be well to mention.

The supposition in regard to the origin of the French imperatives is that they are the corresponding forms of the indicative with the subjects dropt. This is not a mere theory, but a fact as certain as anything in Romance philology. The Latin imperatives do not suffice to explain the French forms. *Dona* and *vade*, it is true, will

give *donne* and *va*, but not the forms with *s*, which are always used when a hiatus would be created by a succeeding vowel, as *donnes-en, vas-y*.¹ These latter are the original and would be the proper forms to be employed in all cases, if custom had not sanctioned the dropping of the *s* where it is not heard in the pronunciation. The ordinary grammars, therefore, which undertake to explain everything, but which, especially where forms are concerned, usually explain nothing logically, ought not to say that the *s* is added in these cases, but that it drops off in all instances, where no hiatus is thereby produced. The first person plural of the imperative has no congener in Latin, and must consequently be considered as an undoubted Romance creation.

Again: *donate* would give any one of three or four forms, but not *donnez* and the older words *donnes* and *donnetz*; that is, *donate* does not account for the final sibilants *s* and *z*. There can be no question, then, that the above explanation is the true one.

To come now to the imperatives of *savoir*: *sache, sachez* and *sachez*. How shall we interpret these forms, admitting that the imperatives are only the corresponding forms of the indicative, the subjects being omitted? Having the same root as the subjunctive, one is tempted to say that they represent the post-classic usage of the Latin subjunctive as a mild imperative; that is, *sache* is elliptical for *que tu saches*. This would account for *sache*, but not for *sachez* and *sachez*, which are not subjunctives in form. The only cases where the subjunctive has usurped the place of the indicative as an imperative are the auxiliary verbs *avoir* and *être*: *aie, ayons, ayez—sois, soyons, soyez*. But these are actual subjunctives, as, with the exception of *aie*, they are all identical in form with the subjunctives of these verbs now in use. Why this should be so I am not prepared to say, but it is possible that good reasons could be found for it, as the same anomaly is observable in others of the Romance languages (Ital. *sii* (*sia*), *abbi*; Wal. subj. *sâ fii*, imper. *fii*; infin. *a avé*; subj. *sâ aî*; imper. *aîbî*, an old subjunctive, as we see, from the third person singular of this tense: *sâ aîba=qu'il ait*). I infer, therefore, from the above reasoning that the imperatives of *savoir*

¹After this article was in type I happened to notice that Brachet, even in the latest edition of his *Gram. Hist.* (p. 210), states that the imperative (2d sing.) is taken from the Latin imperative. This, of course, is untenable for the reason assigned above, and further because the *s* always appears in verbs of the 2d, 3d and 4th conjugations. That the *s* has been dropt in other cases where it is no longer found is certain from *aie*, an admitted subjunctive form (*aies*). *Ab uno disce omnes*.

make no exception to this general rule of the derivation of this mood; that *sache*, *sachons* and *sachez* are old present indicatives, and point to the existence of this tense, having as its root *sach*.

I would sum up then by saying, that the reasons assigned by the grammarians for the existence of this single isolated form as a *subjunctive* are not conclusive; that phonetically the form is possible as an indicative, and there are good grounds for assuming that the whole tense, with the same root, was current at a very early period of the language; and, finally, as bearing on this last point, that there were two inflexions of *savoir* for the present indicative; one, coming directly from the Latin, *je sache*, *tu saches*, etc., present participle *sachant*; and a second and later, of purely French formation, *je sais*, *tu sais*, etc., present participle *savant*.

I will not insist too strongly on the probability of there having existed the whole tense of the indicative with the root *sach*, but I do maintain that the evidence is sufficiently convincing in respect to the first person singular. It would not be extraordinary to have the creation of a single form from certain phonetic conditions, and that this form should survive and coëxist with another homologous form, at the same time having a special use, as has been shown in the case of *je ne sache pas*. We have a good instance of the survival of an isolated form, with a special use, in the imperative of *vouloir*, namely *veuillez*, which is an old second person plural indicative, but which is no longer used as such. The persistence of a principle of grammar, moreover, as has been suggested to me, is much more improbable than that of a form, even if that principle ever existed. But no such principle of syntax ever did obtain in French grammar at any time; and no amount of ingenuity, as it seems to me, can evolve a theory that will throw any satisfactory light on the anomaly here discussed, if we are to continue to accept it as a subjunctive. It is an indicative or it is nothing.

SAMUEL GARNER.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, arranged on an Historical Basis. By the REV. WALTER W. SKEAT, M.A. Part II. Dor—Lit. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.

Until within the last dozen years, English etymology has scarcely deserved the name of a science. The dictionaries of Johnson and Richardson, though treasure-houses of definition and illustration concerning later usage, could furnish but little accurate information about the history of early forms and that physical basis, so to speak, upon which the most spiritual conceptions have been superimposed, or out of which they have been evolved. The same holds of their rivals and successors, almost without exception, till the present day. Those who have undertaken the difficult task have rarely possessed special knowledge and freedom from prejudice at the same time. Ignorance and perverse wrongheadedness, singly or combined, have succeeded in vitiating the most promising attempts, even of individuals who seemed to possess special aptitude for the prosecution of these researches. Yet in the chaos of opinions and results some germs of order have been perceptible. From the days of Horne Tooke onward there has been a gradual accumulation and sifting of material for such a work as now lies before us; German scholarship has discovered and expounded phonetic laws; scientific knowledge of the Teutonic dialects, both ancient and modern, has been attained; Celtic, though still but imperfectly understood, has begun to reward the assiduity of a few devotees; finally, the provincial and archaic English words, which a variety of circumstances had combined to degrade and obscure, have commenced to reassert themselves, and to cast their light upon forms of literary expression.

All this while hazardous conjectures have been made only to be rejected with the advance of scholarship, and etymology after etymology has been imagined which the logic of hard facts has nullified. It is too soon to expect such reckless guessing to cease; ingenious sciolism will still find scope for its energies, and credence for its fanciful deductions.

Prof. Skeat's dictionary, while hardly definitive, even for the present generation, will set a term to much of the vague theorizing which is yet current, and indicate to future investigators the track to be pursued. Heretofore we have had only one work which challenged serious attention through the number and accuracy of its derivations. The great dictionary which passes under the name of Webster possesses a large amount of fairly trustworthy information about etymology, furnished for the most part by the indefatigable German scholar, Dr. Mahn, of Berlin. Everything may be granted which its admirers would claim for Webster, without in the least invalidating the title of Prof. Skeat's book to higher consideration as a strictly etymological dictionary. More it does not pretend to be, and indeed its definitions are meagre and often

couched in the loosest terms, while the illustrative quotations are reduced to a minimum. On the other hand, no labor has been spared to perfect it within the limits assigned. The best authorities have been consulted, and great pains taken to substantiate the etymologies adduced. The historic ordering of the material is admirable, and constitutes the main novelty of Skeat's work, as it will form one of the most valuable features of the Philological Society's stupendous English Dictionary. The utmost perspicuity is attained by the use of algebraic signs to indicate, on the one hand the direct or successive generation of forms; and on the other mere side relationship or remote cognation. Some such method of discrimination between the original of a word and its kin at several removes has long been a desideratum.

Prof. Skeat is cautious about admitting Anglo-Saxon radicals when unsupported by evidence of their actual occurrence in the literature. He has been censured for omitting words which really exist, but this is safer and more laudable than to give the weight of his sanction to the spurious coin uttered by some of his predecessors.

Where he has to deal with phonetic laws Prof. Skeat is not always sure of his footing. Especially is he unguarded and often obscure in his use of the terms 'strong' and 'weak.' For example, under the word *jaw* he says: "The spelling *jowe* may have been suggested by the F. *joue*, a cheek; still, it is certain that the F. word is not original, since *chaw* and *jaw* are stronger forms than *joue*, and could never have come out of it." Under *jabber* we have: "*Jabber*, *jabble*, are weakened forms of *gabber*, *gabble*, frequentative forms of the base *gab*." Under *grate*: "Thus *grate* is a mere variant of *crate*, due to a weakened pronunciation." Under *imbue*: "Lat. *im-*, for *in-*, in; and base BU, weakened form of PU, which is the causal from the base BI, to drink, weakened form of PI, to drink." This last quotation likewise shows Skeat's fondness for going back to primitive Aryan roots, and generally for pushing his inquiries so far that none but a scholar of equal attainments can follow and comprehend him. Thus in the discussion of the word *fur* he asserts that *fur* and *fodder* are doublets, *i. e.* different forms of the same word; even with his explanation the connection will be but dimly apprehended by many who will consult his pages.

Of *flat* he says: "The connection with Gk. *πλατὺς*, broad, has not been made out; it is more likely connected with Du. *vlack*, G. *flach*, flat, Gk. *πλάξ*, a flat surface." Grassmann, in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* XII 107, is for the identification of *flat* with Gk. *πλατὺς*, and strengthens his position as regards phonetic change by a comparison of Gk. *πλαθάνη*. Fick, likewise, *Wbch.* VII 194, adduces *πλάθανον* in connection with *flat*. It is rather *flag* that should be compared with Gk. *πλάξ*, as Weigand has shown s. v. *Flagge* in his *Deutsches Wörterbuch*.

Under the word *gnat* Prof. Skeat remarks that Swed. *gnet* means 'a nit'; "this suggests a possible connection between the two words; yet the A. S. form is *hnit*, which does not seem to be quite the same thing." That is, A. S. *gnat* and A. S. *hnit* do not seem to be quite the same thing, in which conclusion we readily acquiesce.

For Prof. Skeat when at his worst, when most defiant of regular and progressive sound-change, it is only necessary to refer to his treatment of the word *inkling*.

Occasionally, though the phenomenon under consideration be admitted, the

example chosen to support it is unfortunate. Thus under *flatter* Skeat says: "Here, as in many cases (*e. g.* *mate* from A. S. *maca*) the *t* stands for an older *k*." But *mate* does not come from A. S. *maca*. Mätzner, Eng. Gram. I 204, derives *mate* from Netherl. *maet*, and *match* from A. S. *maca*. In like manner Stratmann, Dict. of the Old Eng. Lang., parallels *mate* with O. H. G. *gimazo*; with these two authorities Dr. Mahn also agrees. Diez's etymology for the O. F. *flater*, though rejected by Skeat, has much in its favor, and is far more than plausible.

Under *gate* two distinct words are confounded. Stratmann distinguishes the one meaning 'gait, road,' from the other meaning 'door, passage-way.' Cleasby and Vigfusson, Icelandic Dictionary, also separate the first, as *gata*, from the second, *gdt*. So too in deriving *foil* from O. F. *fouler*, Skeat has confounded two essentially different words. He says: "Corrupted from O. F. *fouler*, just as *defile* from *defouler*." In the glossary to his Altenglische Sprachproben, s. v. *defouler*, Mätzner expressly gives it as his opinion that "Dies hybrid. v. weist auf *fulen*, *foulen*, *filen*, sch. *defoul*, neue. *defile*, besudeln, beflecken," and assigns to another *defoulen*, *defoilen*, from O. F. *defuler*, *defoler*, *deffouler*, the meaning "mit Füßen treten, zertreten, niedertreten," and metaphorically, "bewältigen, unterdrücken."

Flask and *flagon* are not traced back far enough. Diez, s. v. *Fiasco*, Etym. Wbch. der Roman. Spr., p. 178, quotes Greg. M. Dial. 2, 18: *duo lignea vascula, quae vulgo flascones vocantur*, and proceeds to establish the derivation as follows: "Wie durch umstellung des *l* ital. *fiaba* (für *flaba*) aus *fabula*, *pioppo* aus *populus*, sp. *bloca* aus *baculus*, pr. *florone* aus *furunculus* geformt wurden, ebenso *fiasco* aus *vasculum*, mit einer härtung des *v* zu *f*, die hier nicht ausbleiben konnte. *Vasculum* erschöpft alle bedeutungen des rom. oder celt. wortes, es ist gefäß im weitesten sinne."

Dowager is called "a coined word, made by suffixing *r* (for-*er*) to *dowage*." But Littre, s. v. *douairière*, quotes from Du Cange, Gloss. Med. et Infim. Lat., who under *Doageria* has the following from a Charta of A. D. 1388: "Après la mort desquelx Marie de Monceaux, femme dudit Hebert, comme Douagiare (almost certainly for *Douagiere*) a joy et usé par long temps de laditte terre." *Douagère* is also to be found in the Complément to the Academy's French Dictionary, with a reference to *Douairière*.

Skeat has scarcely hit upon the right explanation of *how* (1). March has already shown, Gram. §252, II, that *hui* stands for earlier *hwi*, and that *how* and *why* are therefore doublets, and ultimately identical.

Under *icicle*, Skeat would make *gicel* Celtic. He perceives that Icel. *jökull* has the meaning of Eng. *icicle*, but is inclined to think that *jökull* itself may be borrowed from the Celtic.

Gossip: *Sib* with the meaning 'relative' is A. S. Cf. Grein's Sprachschatz, II 441. *Gesib* is used more frequently, however, in this sense.

Gulf: Skeat appears to have forgotten that *gulf* is used as the equivalent of *gullet* by Shakespeare, Macb. IV, 1, 23. Cf. also Lucr. 557, Cor. I, 1, 101.

Fleet (2): Not "a place where vessels float"; rather like Ger. *Flusz*, 'flowing water.'

Ladle: *Hladel* is found, according to Leo, in Hpt. Gl. 418, with the meaning 'antlia,' which, though not the equivalent of Eng. *ladle*, is not very far off.

Dwarf: How is A. S. *dwellan* suggestive? Certainly it would be hard to show any relationship between the two words.

Ease: Why not from A. S. *edðe*? So Mätzner, Eng. Gram. I 145, and Grimm, Gesch. der d. Sprache 352. Of course the form *ease* is due to French influence, which has reshaped the original word.

By a singular oversight Skeat calls *eld* an obsolete word. The poets still use it, at all events. Thus Byron, Childe Harold, I 93:

"Lands that contain the monuments of Eld."

Longfellow, Prelude to Voices of the Night:

"Tales that have the rime of age
And chronicles of eld."

William Morris, The Earthly Paradise, May:

"And shuddered at the sight of Eld and Death."

Even as 'old man' in Coleridge, The Destiny of Nations:

"To the tottering eld
Still as a daughter would she run; she placed
His cold limbs at the sunny door."

Prof. Skeat is ready to ascribe somewhat too much influence to the Celtic, we think, going to the extent, as under the word *icicle*, of supposing that an Icelandic word was borrowed directly from Old Irish or Welsh. Again, he is inclined to derive English words quite too frequently from the modern Scandinavian or North German languages. As one example out of many, the word *douse* may be cited. Direct derivation from the Swedish is hardly to be thought of in such a case. It might be objected, moreover, that he shows too marked a leaning toward the onomatopoetic theory of which Wedgwood is one of the foremost expounders.

But we have no desire to indulge in carping criticism, for, while many disputed points remain to be settled, and while it is certain that some of Prof. Skeat's positions will prove untenable, his dictionary can only be received with the acknowledgment that it displays great learning, conscientiousness and skill on the part of the editor, and that it is indispensable to all who concern themselves with the history of the English language.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Introduction to the Study of Sign-Language among the North American Indians as illustrating the Gesture-Speech of Mankind. By GARRICK MALLERY, Brevet Lieut.-Col. U. S. Army. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1880.

In this book, which is issued by the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, we have the first attempt in this country to treat sign-language scientifically; the author, aware of the extent of the subject, modestly calls it

nothing more than an introduction, a short statement of some general principles, with suggestions to observers. He properly refers to the value of sign-speech as a universal language, especially for those who have to deal with our Indians; there are some remarkable accounts of the readiness of communication between Indians and deaf-mutes. And while this sign-language excels the other in graphic effect and rapidity, it is also, he thinks, not without capacity of expressing abstract ideas. Then, there is its further utility in the study of picture-writing, which may be regarded as having the same origin with gesture, as being in fact little more than a graphic form of gesture; from it, Col. Mallery thinks, we may learn something of the syntax and the root-meanings of the spoken languages. Whether, says he, the order of the signs is the order of the spoken language depends on whether a sign- or picture-writing has intervened between the primitive sign-speech and spoken language (Col. Mallery assumes throughout the evolutionist theory of language). If such writing has not intervened, the writing will follow the order of words in speaking; if it has, the picture-writing and the spoken language will both follow the order of the signs. The difficulty about this is that the assumption of a picture-writing between the two phases of language is hardly warranted; we know of such writing only among tribes who have reached a well developed spoken language. What light the study of the picture-writing and the signs will throw on syntax we cannot tell; they have been so little studied that it would be premature to express an opinion. If a syntactical principle can be discovered in the signs it may give the genesis of Indian syntax, and possibly help us to comprehend the origin of the sentence. One school of philologists at the present day wish to see in the sentence the unit of speech, and to explain inflections as the breaking up of the sentence-word into its parts. A sign may represent such a sentence-word, and the comparison of the spoken language may show its existence there. But it would be extremely unsafe to reason from the sign to the language without having made a thorough study of the latter; and we should therefore suggest to our author to urge on his collaborators the earnest study of the Indian tongues with which they have to deal. Col. Mallery further points out that pantomime and gesture is natural to man, and he expresses the opinion that language comes partly from certain sounds that naturally accompany certain gestures, voice and gesture then moving on in parallel development. As to the modern use of gesture and sign, he suggests that it is occasioned by the contact of strange dialects, and that it is discontinued when a common dialect comes into use. In illustration he cites the gesticulating French and Italians, who live in the midst of a babel of dialects, in contrast with the isolated insular and ungesticulating English; but here national temperament comes into play. Among our Indians sign-talking is universal as an art—they all employ it, except the civilized tribes, but our author gives abundant examples to show that there is no one universal sign-language. The examples he gives of various signs for the same idea are curious and interesting. The pamphlet ends with an excellent set of instructions to observers.

We are glad that so competent a man as Col. Mallery is interesting himself in the investigation. What is now lacking is regulated intelligent coöperation, and we bespeak for him the assistance of all persons who are in position to

acquire accurate information on the subject. So far as linguistic results are concerned, we look for light from these inquiries rather in the analogy between the developments of signs and language than from any material and substantive relation to be exhibited between the two. The processes of mind are the same, or nearly the same, in both cases, and we shall be able to study the psychology of language in that of this other and lower means of communication, as we study the physical and mental organization of man in that of the lower animals.

C. H. TOY.

THE NUMBER AND GENERAL CHARACTER OF AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS FOR 1879, IN ROMANCE PHILOLOGY AND LITERATURE.

Statistics of publication are usually regarded as a pretty sure barometer by which the rise or fall of interest or activity in any given department of science may be measured. This is true, I think, however, as applied to language, only in so far as the study of it has advanced beyond the purely practical stage, or the immediate wants of the community for text-books have not already been supplied. Both of these conditions have been well illustrated by the most recent American contributions to Romance philology and literature. Up to date not a single original scientific treatise has appeared with us in this field, while the development of the pedagogical side of it has been so extraordinary that we stand second only to Germany, perhaps, in the number of aids offered to the student who is seeking an acquaintance with the rudiments of these languages. Besides a large number of imported works, no less than 364 grammars, hand-books and other elementary helps are now actually to be had of our own publishers. About five-sixths of these belong to the French alone, the remaining sixth being divided between the Spanish and Italian, with a proportion of three to one in favor of the former.

Fully nine-tenths of all the works here mentioned are introductory in the strictest sense of the term, while a large part of the other tenth is nothing but a repetition of methods already issued under another form, the existence of which, in certain cases, has been lost sight of, in others, wilfully ignored. These, we hold, have virtually no *raison d'être*, as they have simply multiplied the difficulties of selection for the scholar, without adding in any way to the reduction of his expense or time in acquiring the fundamental laws of the language. We need not, moreover, be surprised with this long list of educational works to draw on, and with no introduction, as yet, into the scientific study of the Neo-Latin idioms, that the last year (1879) has been particularly barren in production in this department. It has been characterized by a marked falling off in the number of conversational and purely elementary manuals, by the absence of all 6- or 12-lesson methods, and of all 'lightning-train' issues for learning 'without study'; nor has any new 'short-cut' series been proposed or 'leather-bottle' exercises invented for the acquisition of French 'without a master.' We have evidently touched bottom, and an era of common sense is about to set in, which we owe, perhaps, in great measure to the blessings conferred upon us by the *méthode naturelle*.

The majority of American publications for this period has been of two kinds, pedagogical and literary, with the bulk of the work limited to translations of the latter sort, and particularly of fiction. Leaving out of account, then, English treatments of subjects connected with Romance literature, the sum total of all publications amounts to 59, of which 58 belong to the French and one to the Spanish. The other Romance languages are not represented by any work. If, now, we compare the educational with the non-educational productions, we have only 8 of the former standing over against 51 of the latter. This very small proportion of educational works is, it seems to me, a significant hint as to what the immediate future will require for these studies in America. Our pedagogical needs for French and Spanish are moderately well supplied. We have enough elementary treatises for the present. The demand is now most urgent for advanced methods based upon scientific principles of the historic growth of language. The leading canons of French grammar, especially, have been cast in a variety of moulds sufficient to last us for another generation. Scientific investigation, a higher standard of practical teaching, a reaching out after more extensive culture in these languages, are the pressing needs of our time.

Of the 51 non-educational works just named, two only are reprints (French), while the remaining 49 are translations covering almost every department of literature, science, etc., with fiction at the head and history at the tail end of the list. Novels lead off with 17 volumes, to which Émile Zola has contributed the largest number of any single author, viz. five—a fact which, in itself, would seem to have a striking significance with reference to the materialistic tendencies of our novel-reading public. This author's popularity in America, over that of his contemporary fellow-countrymen, is due, however, in part most certainly, to pure curiosity. A volume like *L'Assommoir*, of which one hundred thousand copies were sold in France in a few weeks, would naturally arouse great curiosity on this side of the water to see what is in it, and then other works of the same writer would follow as a matter of business speculation. Next to Zola come Gréville (Mme. Durand), Theuriet and Verne, with two volumes apiece. Following fiction we have biography represented by 11 translations, science by 8, art and drama by 3 each, and finally the closing group—music, literature and political economy—by 2 each.

Of the eight educational works seven are French and one Spanish (an elementary Spanish primer, which, it is hoped, will do no special harm). If there is any one sign in book-making that indicates an improvement in the moral sense of French grammar-manufacturers, it is surely the fact that the whole year 1879 inflicted on the American public only three treatises of this sort. Two of these are harmless productions of extreme elementary pretensions; the third is *sui generis*,—a *curiosum* of peculiar merit. Its author must be blessed with a big bump of originality (a quality not possessed by many of his predecessors), and be, besides, a close observer of the leading traits of American character. It is to our intense appreciation of the ludicrous that he appeals with the following modest title: "Comical French Grammar; or, French in an amusing point of view, being extractic, fantastic, idiomatic, methodic, phlegmatic, theatric and graphic."

The most propitious augury for the future, perhaps, in these studies, is the

disposition to examine into previous methods before launching out upon some apparently new theory or system. With the increase of this spirit we are sure to have the 300 and odd educational works now in the book-market overhauled very soon, and a little light thrown on the utter waste of energy expended in the writing of at least three-fourths of them. It is not much credit to our American scholarship that there should be so few traces of rigid scientific method in the whole range of these studies, while our German friends for three-quarters of a century have been making valuable contributions to our knowledge almost every year in this great and important department of learning. Within the shell of the common pedagogical routine the few American scholars have shut themselves up who could have rendered good service in this field, under more favorable circumstances of an interchange of ideas and of united effort. The current year, we hope, will bring about an attempt to set aside, in part at least, this disadvantage, and to establish some centre of influence by which a more just appreciation of these studies may be promulgated.

Scheme showing the number of works published in America in the department of Romance languages for 1879, and the subjects to which these works belong:

EDUCATIONAL.	(1)	French,	Grammars,	3	
			Manuals of conversion,	2	
	(2)	Spanish,	Hand-book,	1	
			Reader,	1	
			Primer,	1	
				—	Total, 8
NON-EDUCATIONAL.	(1) Reprints, (French.)			2	" 2
	(2)	Translations, (French.)	Fiction,	17	
			Biography,	11	
			Science,	8	
			Art,	3	
			Drama,	3	
			Music,	2	
			Literature,	2	
			Polit. Economy,	2	
			History,	1	
				—	Total, 49
Whole number,					59

A. M. ELLIOTT.

REPORTS.

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT, 1879,
XXXIII Band, I und II Heft.

1. Das indogermanische Pronomen. By A. F. Pott. In an examination of H. Chauvée's recent work, *Idéologie Lexicologique* (an attempt at the restoration of original Indo-European by the laws of lexicological phonology and lexicological ideology), Pott undertakes to show that the Indo-European pronominal elements are all consciously significant. He assumes as his basis a symbolical significance (illustrated from non-Aryan languages) for vowels and consonants: *i*, he holds, expresses nearness, *a* distance, *m*, as least opening of the mouth, the speaker, *t*, as intermediate opening, the near object, *k*, as greatest opening, is the all-embracing, and so that which calls for determination, the interrogative and indefinite sign. His elaborate, richly-learned examination of the various and perplexing ramifications of the IE pronoun is always instructive, if not always convincing. In the Mid. and Pass. verbal personal terminations he regards the diphthong as symbolizing the suffering object; *s* he takes to be a different stem from *t*, having for its object the distinction between the sexual and the non-sexual (yet only in the subject-case); *a* in *asma* he thinks may express nearness, and *vas* (*vos*) duality (of speaker and person addressed); Plu. *as* in nouns he makes sign of addition (*devāsas* = God this+that). His repugnance to what he calls the "Darwinian" theory of language seems unnecessary.

2. Zur Pehlevi-Münzkunde. By A. D. Mordtmann. Mordtmann describes various Pehlevi coins collected by himself and others, illustrates his view that they exhibit three eras (Hejira, Yezdegird, 10 H., and Taberi, 30 H.), maintains his formerly announced discovery of a hitherto unknown coin-prince Vischtachma Piruzi, makes various geographical remarks, and replies to Nöldeke's strictures (Vol. 31 of ZDMG).

3, 4. Th. Nöldeke has two articles, one on Iranische Ortsnamen auf Kert, etc., in which he defends the derivation of *kert* from Iranian *karta*, *kereta* = "made"; the other entitled Zwei Völker Vorderasiens, investigating the location and history of the Qadishaye and Ortaye: the former (dwelling up to the 7th century of our era in Siggir and Tebeth in middle Mesopotamia), a savage, warlike people, with a peculiar religion, not unlike the Kurds; the latter (found in southern Armenia, probably up to the middle of the 9th century), converted to Christianity towards the end of the 4th century.

5. Rigveda X, 85, Die Vermählung des Soma und der Sûrya. By J. Ehni. According to Dr. Ehni the Soma in this passage is twofold: first, the moon, the holder of the heavenly soma-juice, the gods' drink of immortality; and then a heavenly soma-plant, out of which is pressed the drink of life. Sûrya is the advancing sun, proceeding from the winter solstice to the vernal equinox.

The song is a description of the Hindu spring, or the period from the beginning of January to the end of April, the moon standing in the double character of ruler of the night and outpourer of lifegiving moisture, and the sun appearing as ruler of the day and dispenser of fructifying warmth.

6. Ueber die Mâitrayani Samhita, ihr Alter, etc. By Leopold Schroeder. This work, S. thinks, was known to Panini, and used and highly valued by him. It has striking peculiarities, phonetic (change of final untuned *a* and *as* before toned initial vowels to *â*, but, if these tone-conditions be not observed, to *a*, change of *t* before *ç* to *ñ*, etc.), accentual (complicated method of indicating accents), lexicographical (it contains words cited by the Hindu grammarians and lexicographers, and till now found nowhere else, and S. has found in it three hundred words not given in the Petersburg Dictionary). The work is ancient, but the name Maitrayani is of later origin, and S.'s account of the change of name (following a suggestion of Weber's) throws a curious light on the early relations between Buddhism and Brahmanism.

7. Wilhelm Spitta (*Die Lücken in Jawâliki's Mûarrab*) fills out (from two MSS. in the viceregal library at Cairo) some of the gaps in Sachau's edition of Jawâliki's work on the foreign words in Arabic, and makes a welcome addition to our knowledge of Arabic phonetics.

8. C. Sandreczki contributes a second article on *Die Maltesische Mundart* (the first in Vol. 30, ZDMG), fairly establishing its essentially Arabic character, and preparing the way for further researches.

9. Zu Rigveda 5, 2, 1-6. By Alfred Hillebrandt. H. supposes in the song two Agnis: a heavenly, born of the Ushas, and an earthly, born of the pieces of wood rubbed together on the altar; the object of the song being to free him from the enemies that retard his birth.

10. Zur semitischen Epigraphik. By K. Schlottmann. After a defence of his transcription and translation of the Carpentras inscription and of his assumption of rhyme and rhythm therein, against the arguments of De Lagarde, S. makes an examination of the principles of metre in Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic, and undertakes to show that they are founded in the nature of these languages severally. Granting his transcription, his exhibition of the metric principles of procedure by ictus (in distinction from mere counting of syllables) and of rhyme in so early an inscription, is striking.

In the *Bibliographische Anzeigen Spiegel* (in a review of Harlez's Avestan works) takes occasion to discuss the date of the Avesta (which he thinks uncertain) and the meaning of the word (he makes it = "word of God," the whole or a part of the sacred writings), and to defend Burnouf's method of interpretation (which uses linguistic science to control tradition) against Bopp's (the purely linguistic). He thinks the metrical text older than that of the MSS. (the arrangers having added prose sections), and the Gathas as not far from the rest of the Avesta in thought and date.

Th. Nöldeke's somewhat severe notice of Schrader's *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung* (a reply to Gutschmid's *Neue Beiträge*, etc.) accords to S. only partial success in meeting G.'s objections, and demands of the Assyriologists greater accuracy in grammar and etymology. In view of the "wild irregularity in vocalization and endings," he suggests that many of the signs now regarded

as syllabic may represent consonants only, though he admits that great difficulties stand in the way of such a supposition.

III Heft.

1. Die Werthbezeichnungen auf muhammedanischen Münzen. By Stickel and von Tiesenhausen. Stickel maintains (against von T.), with strong lexicographical and commercial arguments, the view that the coin-marks in question are indications of value and genuineness.

2. Die Sprache der Turkomanen und der Diwan Machdumkuli's. By H. Vámbéry. Vámbéry points out that the Turkoman language agrees with the western and not with the eastern idioms of its linguistic family (as, in vowel-euphony, case-endings, pass. partcp., compound perf., fut., neg. and gerund), though its precise place is hard to determine. His translation of a part of M.'s poem throws an interesting light on Muhammedan ethics as represented by the ascetic teachers of the Steppe in the second half of the last century.

3. Dhanapāla's Rishabhpancaṅkā. By Joh. Klatt. Together with text and translation Klatt gives some account of the linguistic peculiarities of this first specimen of a Jainastotra written in Prakrit, and appends a word-index (Prakrit-Sanskrit) and a list of Jaina MSS. in the Berlin library.

4. Die himjarischen Inschriften im Tschinili Kiöschk. By J. H. Mordtmann. In these inscriptions (a connected translation of which is impossible, says the writer, from their fragmentary character) Mordtmann thinks he finds the hitherto undiscovered suffix of the third person dual, *suman* (corresponding to the Arabic *huma*), wherein he makes the tolerably precarious supposition of an original final *n* (nunation) in this suffix.

5. F. Spiegel explains Aḍar Gushasp (frequently occurring in the Eranian book of kings) as signifying originally a sacred fire, and so, from the myths with which it was connected, much used in comparisons, and also, since it was chosen as protector by living persons, frequently found as proper name.

6. Victor von Strauss and Torney discuss various words used in Chinese to indicate shades of blue and green.

In the Bibliographische Anzeigen Th. Nöldeke, in a notice of Friedrich Baethgen's "Sindban oder die sieben weisen Meister: syrisch und deutsch," discusses the Syrian text, the Greek translation of Andreopolos, the Hebrew, Spanish, and Persian translations, and the Arabic original. In the Syriac he finds no trace of Pehlevi influence, but good proof that it was made from the Arabic. The relations of the great and small Sindbad-book, the Pehlevi from which the Arabic is said to be made, and the Indian from which the Pehlevi probably came, are involved in obscurity. The original Sanskrit form of "Sindbad" (Benfey suggests Siddhapati), Nöldeke leaves undetermined.

W. Schott reviews H. Vámbéry's book on Die primitive Cultur des Turko-Tatarischen Volkes, in which the results are based on linguistic researches. V. finds a well-formed family life (no trace of community of wives or polyandry) in the earliest known condition of the nation. To the title *chaqan* (chan, khan) he assigns the signification of "wild boar," but Schott refers it to a root meaning "divide," "decide." V. does not accept the Accadian or Sumerian civilization as a historical fact.

E. Nestle gives a short notice of an edition of the poems of Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, issued at Rome (an indication of a revival of Syriac studies there) by the Maronite Scebabi, who says nothing of the source of his text (Nestle says it is not the MS. brought to Rome by J. S. Assemani.)

IV Heft (Oct. 1879).

1. *Ostindische Kaste in der Gegenwart*. Von Emil Schlagintweit. This article is based on the reports of English census-officers for a number of years, consists, indeed, largely of extracts from them. The conclusions arrived at by the English officers are so various that a complete scientific history of Indian caste cannot be given; but Schlagintweit sums up as follows: Caste is an institution for the maintenance of political authority; it sprang from the relations between the dark-skinned natives and the fair-skinned Aryan invaders. At first intermarriages were general, from which in the course of generations came mixed races of various shades of color. After a while the necessity was felt of checking this intermixture, and marriage with the blacks was forbidden, a definite rank was assigned to each shade of color, and this arrangement was referred to divine prescription. Buddhism set aside the religious sanctity of caste, but could not shake it as a racial distinction; Islam has had to accept it, only using it as a guard against the oppression of the Hindus; Christianity alone has shaken it off, though its earliest representatives (Roman Catholics) tolerated it. Caste-divisions have followed the divisions of occupations, as among Brahmans, peasants, agricultural laborers, shepherds, servants and tradespeople—and tribal divisions, as among the Dravidic peoples of the south. Caste means social division, suspicion, hatred; hence the lack of unity in India, and the ease with which the people have submitted to foreign domination. The hope of the land is in the European culture which strives to root out this pernicious institution. The process of caste-formation has been going on for a long time, is still active, and the number of castes is almost beyond finding out; the English census gives about 2500 main divisions, not reckoning the subdivisions, of which in Madras alone nearly 3900 were found. The Brahmans are now the only undoubted representatives of the Aryan element. Among the Muhammedans there are four principal castes, besides many lesser ones; in the southwest Christian (Roman Catholic) Brahmans were found in 1872 observing certain caste-regulations.

2. *Jugend- und Strassenpoesie in Kairo*. Mitgetheilt von Ignaz Goldziher. Taking occasion from Rev. H. H. Jessup's valuable book on "The Women of the Arabs," in which, in a "Children's Chapter," he gives interesting information about Arab nursery rhymes, but without the Arabic originals, Goldziher communicates a number of children's songs, chiefly gathered by himself from the streets of Cairo. The songs show childish inconsequence, and great variety in the matter, sarcasm, humor, gayety, love, and of course a religious element. Here is something not unlike the religious song of the Southern negro:

If Noah had been struck by the tears of my eye, he'd have sunk;
If Abraham had encountered my love-pain, he'd have been consumed;
If the mountains had to endure what I endure, they'd be ground to dust;
And Moses would faint.

These songs contain many strange interjections, but otherwise the language, as reported by Goldziher, exhibits little that is unusual. In a bit of Ramadân poetry we find the verb *haway* in the sense of "say," "tell," familiar to us in Aramaic, but strange to classical Arabic.

3. Die Apsaras nach dem Mahâbhârata. Von Adolf Holtzmann. The Apsaras are female divine beings of eternal youth and imperishable beauty, corresponding to the male Gandharva. Their number is not given; at the sacrificial feast of the Dilîpa 6000 of them dance. There are various accounts of their origin: according to the Vishnupurâna they sprang from the sea (perhaps an etymological myth, from *ap*, "water," and *sar*, "go," comp. Ἀφροδίτη), but according to the M. they are daughters of Kaçyapa and sisters of the Gandharva, or they are the direct creation of Brahman, from his eyes. In the epos they are properly attendants of Indra, and ordinarily dwell in Indra's heaven, where with the Gandharva they delight the gods with music, song and dance. Later they are found in connection with Çiva and Vishnu. With rare exceptions (a love-affair with Indra is mentioned, and one with Kubera) their lovers are inferior deities and human kings and heroes. The celestial musicians, the Gandharva, are their inseparable companions, and apparently their spouses, though "Gandharva-marriage" is a synonym for a loose union between man and woman; and their unions with men are frequent but transient. They are often sent by Indra to seduce from sanctity some saint of whom the god is jealous; in these villainous expeditions they sometimes succeed (the famous Çakuntalâ was the daughter of the sage Viçvâmitra and Menakâ, the fairest of the Apsaras) and sometimes fail, and are always in danger of being terribly punished by the wrathful saint. The friendly relations between earthly heroes and the heavenly Apsaras continue after the death of the former. In later times the drama was represented as an invention of the heavenly singers, male and female. In the M. there is no trace of a cultus of the Apsaras. The developed Brahmanism of a later period was unfriendly to these beautiful but morally unclean goddesses, and they gradually sank into insignificance; the Indian grammarians place their name among the nouns of which only the plural occurs. The physical-elemental side of the Apsaras found in the Veda-literature (disastrous mists—according to A. Weber the name signifies "formless," from *psaras* = *rûpa*) does not occur in the M., whose representation is anthropomorphic reshaping of the old material, such as Homer and Hesiod effected for the Greeks.

4. Nâsir Chusran's Rûsânainâma, oder Buch der Erleuchtung, in Text und Uebersetzung nebst Noten und kritisch-biographischem Appendix. Von Prof. Dr. Hermann Ethé. Dr. Ethé makes it probable that this oldest of the Persian didactic poets was born in Balch, A. H. 394 (A. D. 1004). The poem is characterized by ethical elevation, and is aphoristic and naïve in style, enjoins wisdom, humility, beneficence, early rising, and opposes asceticism and the Dervish; it is bitter against fools, and has much in common with Shakspere and the Bible. Ethé's text is that of the Gotha MS. with comparison of the Leyden MS., which is a different recension, and of one in the India Office Library (No. 1430, date A. H. 1061), which is midway between these two.

5. Ein melkitischer Hymnus an die Jungfrau Maria. Veröffentlicht von Friedrich Baethgen. (Mit einer Tafel.) The MS. Petermann 28 of the Berlin

Royal Library, from which this hymn is taken, consists of 270 leaves, beginning and end wanting, date not given; Prof. Sachau refers the Melkitic writing to the 13th or 14th century. The MS. seems to have suffered early, and there are traces of two restorers. It contains a collection of hymns to Christ, the Virgin, the Apostles, Saints, for deceased persons, etc., set to the eight church melodies, and designed for the several days of the week; the book belonged to a Melkitic congregation. Some linguistic peculiarities remind us in part of the Syrian-Palestinian dialect: the gutturals are often powerless; the 1 pers. sing. perf. is regularly written with Yud, which is also found in nouns (as mere vowel-letter); final Alaf is omitted in certain demonstratives; verbs First Yud take frequently prosthetic Alaf where the Yud has no consonantal force.

6, 7. Das japanische Schachspiel. Von K. Himly. (Mit einer Tafel.) Einige Worte über das persische Brettspiel Nerd. Von K. Himly. The Japanese game of chess, says Himly, is the most complicated of the simple and older chess-games proper, and beyond doubt came to Japan from China, though it is now very different from the Chinese game. There is no native tradition either in China or in Japan of a foreign origin of the game. The Persian Nerd is similar to the European Puff or Trictrac; its origin, as well as that of the Chinese-Japanese *swan-liu*, or "Twice Six," seems to be Indian.

8. Ueber eine Handschrift des Mufassal. Von A. Socin. This valuable MS., numbered 425 in the Hohenzollern Library at Sigmaringen, was presented by H. R. H. Prince Karl of Rumania to his father, and deposited in the library in 1878. It was captured in the late Russo-Turkish war, and seems to have been found at Rahova; an inscription on the MS. further states that the Sherif Emim Sha'ir, body-servant of Ali Agâ, had presented it to Tirnova for the students of science, on the condition that it was not to be removed from the library of the place or sold; the date of the inscription is A. H. 1176 (began July 23, 1762). How the MS. came from Tirnova to Rahova is not known. It is 14 centimetres in breadth, 17 cm. in height, is of cotton-paper, and contains on 270 leaves small 4to the complete text of the Mufassal. It is well preserved, the writing is a handsome and clear old Neshi, the more important vowel-points are inserted by the first scribe, the place is Herat, and the date the eighth century of the Muhammedan era (fourteenth of the Christian era). Another inscription declares that this MS. had been compared with another, which had been compared with a third, which had been compared with the original MS. of the author, Zamahshari. Our MS. contains numerous valuable remarks: all the half-verses cited in the M. are filled out and partially explained, and in addition a number of grammatical elucidations appended.

9. In the Notizen und Correspondenzen Th. Nöldeke makes a contribution Zur Pehlevi-Sprache und Münzkunde, a list of Indian MSS. in the possession of Prof. H. Jacobi in Münster i. W. is given, and A. Müller has a communication on Shemitic verbs *l'p* and *l''p*, undertaking to show that originally bisyllabic roots in Shemitic have been formally assimilated to the trisyllabic by strengthening either the vowel on the second (and occasionally the first) consonant: Müller insists on the simplicity of this scheme, but recognizes its difficulties, which he does not here undertake to discuss. Prof. G. Bickell, in a letter to the editors, defends his Hebrew metrical theory against the objections of Schlottmann.

10. In the Bibliographische Anzeigen A. F. Mehren has remarks on the lexicographical Perlenschnüre of Selîm Effendi Anhûrî of Damascus, Beirût, 1878, Heft I, and Fleischer on Ibn Ja'ish's Commentary on Zamachshari's Mufasssal, edited at the expense of the German Oriental Society by Dr. G. Jahn, Heft III, IV, Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus.

C. H. Toy.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE, 1879, March-April.

1. J. Halevy gives a Note supplémentaire sur l'Inscription de Byblos, proposing various new readings and translations, filling out supposed lacunae, and giving a complete text and translation: he reads the name of the king's father Yehudbaal (only one of Baal), makes the offerings a bronze altar, a piece of gold sculpture and a city of gold (a Fortuna), and supposes the king to enjoin on every one who makes additions to the structure to put his (the king's) name on it. He regards the dialect as differing from that of Sidon, and showing a remarkable similarity to the Hebrew, and discusses Phenician female divinities, especially their independence of the male deities.

2. Notice sur les tribus Arabes de la Mésopotamie. By C. Huart. A translation of a modern Arabic work (1865), with instructive geographical notes.

3. C. de Harlez contributes his third article Des Origines du Zoroastrisme, devoted to the *Monde infernal*, and by an examination of various words and names in the Avesta seeks to show that it is not the result of a religious revolution, nor of a simple development of old Aryan myths, or, more exactly, of the storm-myth ("l'oragisme"), but the product of a combination of primitive or restored natural polytheism, dualism, and an imperfect monotheism.

4. H. Zotenberg gives the conclusion of his Mémoire sur la Chronique Byzantine de Jean, Évêque de Nikiou (Ethiopic translation), full of curious details concerning the Muhammedan conquest of Egypt.

May-June.

1. Leçons de Calcul d'Aryabhata. By L. Rodet. The author does not discuss the questions connected with the Indian origin of the decimal numeration, and a possible Greek influence on Aryabhata (about A. D. 500-550), but limits himself to remarks (in connection with the translation) on the Indian mathematical knowledge of the time.

2. In his Notes de Lexicographie Assyrienne (second article) Stanislas Guyard among other things defends the Assyrian origin of the indefinite pronoun *nin*, "whatever" (which he makes a corruption of *mim* = *mimma*), sees in the second element of *sakanakku*, "grand pontiff," and *isakku*, "vicar," the Accadian *akku* (= *aggu*), "great," and renders *gasisi* (in the inscriptions of Assurhanipal) by "gibbets."

3. R. Duval gives a Notice sur la Dialecte de Ma'loulâ, founded on a vocabulary made by Huart from the mouths of the inhabitants, following in general Nöldeke's sketch (ZDMG, XXI) of this Syriac dialect, but making additional remarks suggested by Huart's fuller collection. The language is markedly affected by the Arabic.

4. Poème de Çabi, en Dialecte Chalka. By R. Basset. The text, transcription and translation of a popular Berber Muhammedan poem, with a short sketch of the dialect.

5. Traduction Arabe du Traité des Corps flottants d'Archimède. By H. Zotenberg. The MS. (National Library, Arabic Supplement, No. 952 *bis*) is dated, says the author, 358 H., and the Arabic text conforms entirely neither to the Greek text nor to the Latin translation.

In the *Nouvelles et Mélanges* there is a notice of Cunningham's *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. I, by E. Senart (who maintains against C. the common Shemitic origin of the two Indian alphabets); an examination of the monosyllabic Rong and Mikir languages (spoken between Nepal and Butan), on the basis of the grammars of Mainwaring and Neighbor, by L. Feer; an explanation of two Assyrian passages, by J. Oppert; a defence (against Delitzsch and Lenormant) of the Shemitic character of *qatu*, by Derenbourg; and an unfavorable notice of Geldner's *Traduction d'Extraits de l'Avesta*, by C. de Harlez.

October-December.

1. Études Bouddhiques. Le Livres des cent Légendes (Avadâna-Çataka). Par M. Léon Feer. (Suite et fin). The object of these Buddhist Studies is to show that there is an intimate connection between the Avadâna-Çataka and the similar collections called Kalpadruma-Avadâna and Ratna-Avadâna on the one hand, and the Dvâviṇçati-Avadâna on the other, the first-named standing midway between the other two groups; a comparative table of contents of the three groups is appended. M. Feer has here considered only surviving Sanskrit works, but hopes hereafter to examine those which are preserved in Tibetan translations.

2. Mémoire sur les Guerres des Chinois contre les Coréens, de 1618 à 1637, d'après les Documents Chinois, par M. Camille Imbault-Huart. An interesting narration of the conquest of Corea by the first Mandchu dynasty. The absence of Korean books makes it necessary to have recourse to Chinese authorities, whose accounts, it is possible, have an undue Chinese coloring. The author states that several thousand Coreans have fled from the oppression of their own government to the adjoining Russian territory, and have become Russian subjects, half of them already Christianized. They are described as quiet, simple, modest, industrious folks.

3. Correspondance du Philosophe Soufi Ibn Sab'in Abd Oul Haqq avec l'Empereur Frédéric II de Hohenstaufen. Publiée d'après le Manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Bodléienne, contenant l'Analyse générale de cette Correspondance et la Traduction du quatrième Traité sur L'Immortalité de L'Âme. Par M. A. F. Mehren. Ibn Sab'in (A. D. 1216-1271), born in Spain, but forced, it is said, by religious persecution to leave his country, went first to Tunis, whence he was again driven, and finally found a refuge in Mecca, where he professed his heretical opinions till his death. M. Amari has proved that the Emperor Frederic II was the Christian prince who asked the questions to which this letter is a reply. It is instructive for the history of the times that the philosopher treats the emperor *de haut en bas*, not scrupling to call him an ignorant simpleton over and over again. Ibn Sab'in's philosophy is Sufite mysticism with the then

prevalent Aristotelianism and Platonism as its logical and psychological basis; his argument for the immortality of the soul is that thought is not material.

4. *Matériaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la Numismatique et de la Métrologie Musulmanes*, traduits ou recueillis et mis en Ordre par M. H. Sauvare, Consul de France. Première partie—Monnaies. This article is made up chiefly of citations from native authorities, giving the origin of coined money among the Arabs (under Abd el Malek, A. H. 76), the value of various coins, and the laws controlling the currency.

5. In the *Nouvelles et Mélanges* M. Pavet de Courteille offers some criticisms on Hermann Vámbéry's work: *Die primitive Cultur des Turko-Tatarischen Volkes auf Grund sprachlicher Forschungen* erörtert, Leipzig, 1879. Among other things Vámbéry says that *sart*, the oldest form of the word for "merchant," means also "wanderer," "stranger," and to-day indicates the Turkish-speaking Iranians of pure Iranian type as the first merchants who had dealings with the Turks. Pavet de Courteille, however, gives good reasons for holding that the word signifies sedentary persons (merchants or agriculturists) in opposition to nomads, and has no ethnical force. For the rest he thinks Vámbéry's book a useful one.

C. H. TOY.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von Karl Bartsch, Wien, 1879.

The twenty-fourth volume shows in its four numbers the honest work we may always expect from the management, and betokens assured prosperity. That hereafter all shorter reviews will be left to a newly started organ, *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, we do not like even if the space thus saved, as the editor assures us, should be to the advantage of more detailed criticisms. The average American student of Germanic lore is not blessed with an abundance of means for subscriptions.

The first number of the *Germania* contains contributions from the editor, Dr. Bartsch, *Die beiden literarischen Stellen bei Rudolf von Ems*, and *Ein altes Bücherverzeichniss*. The first paper discusses the chronological order of Rudolf's poems, Wilhelm and Alexander, and is an answer to an article by J. Schmidt in *Paul und Braune's Beiträge* 3, 140-181, and the second gives a list of 31 volumes formerly in the *Schlosskapelle* at Wittenberg, mentioned in a catalogue of the fifteenth century.

Reinhold Bechstein, editor of *Gottfried's Tristan* in *Brockhaus' deutsche Classiker des Mittelalters*, has an able paper on the passage in *Tristan*:

Dâ von wând'er untæte
Von sînem neven âne sîn

in which he explains the difficulty which R. Sprenger finds in understanding these verses (4th number of *Germania*, 1877), and tries to obviate by a different reading. On page 11, 17th line from above of the article, an error has crept in. It should read *âne sîn* (mit Absicht, etc.).

Reinhold Köhler contributes a minor article Ueber ein Meisterlied von dem rothen Kaiser, with reference to legends based upon the struggle between Emperor Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III, as they existed in the song and prose of Germany and Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and Felix Liebrecht treats of some fescennine verses occurring in German, English, Italian, Latin and New-Greek, under the heading Die krachende Bettstatt, ein Sprachschwank.

The most important paper of the number is one by Otto Behagel, of Heidelberg, Beiträge zur deutschen Syntax, prompted by an article of W. Scherer in the Ztschft. f. deut. Alt. 22, 321. In a former communication to the same quarterly, Scherer hints at a probable preference of a High-German idiom at the imperial chancery of the Low-German Saxon monarchs, and now finds a sure testimony for a "Schriftsprache" as early as the eleventh century, in the exchanging of the dative and accusative of the personal pronoun by a copyist of the Leiden MS. of Williram's paraphrase of the song of Salomon. S. thinks the writer of that codex received through the influence of the Schriftsprache some idea of the High-German distinction of the cases, not sufficient however to enable him properly to discriminate, and thus he foisted his errors in *mir* and *mih* upon the document. This Behagel concludes to be at any rate a very strange influence of a standard written speech, to cause him who strives to use it to corrupt the correct language of his original MS., and asks whether this usage of the copyist be not capable of a different explanation. B. cites instances where the same form stands for both dative and accusative, from languages which do not come within the scope of Scherer's explanation, and argues that the practice in question in the Leiden MS. need not necessarily have come through an influence of the High-German Schriftsprache, but may rest upon syntactical usage of the transcriber's dialect. In further support of his argument Behagel appeals to living dialects, and adduces a host of examples from various Low-German districts. The valuable and lengthy paper closes with his views respecting this singular usage.

A. Edzardi continues his Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der Eddalieder, with a review of passages from the Voluspá, Vegtamskviða and Vafpruðismál. E. considers Sophus Bugge's elucidations of the Vsp. in the main the best, but regards his change in the order of strophes (followed by Hildebrand and approved by Simrock in his Edda) not justifiable in the face of the testimony of the Codex Regius and Hauksbók. In summing up his arguments against Bugge's opinion, Edzardi ventures upon a very ingenious explanation of the discrepancies in parts of the Voluspá. He believes its present form the result of a combination of a younger Ragnarok song and fragments of an older cosmogonic poem, with a mythological didactic poem put in the mouth of a seeress. This leads him to a conjecture as to the want of congruity in the strophes of the Vegtamskviða. In embodying the Ragn. song with the Vsp., the epic introduction of the former was dropped and formed in turn the basis of the Vgt., now the first five strophes of that poem, to which a later skald added nine of mythological dialogue.

K. Maurer supplies the text of a fragment Zum alten schwedischen Hofrechte, discovered in the Norwegian government archives, communicated to him by

Dr. G. Storm, of Christiania, and according to that gentleman dating from 1400. C. M. Blaas furnishes a list of nursery rhymes of Lower-Austria; and Adalbert Baier in a paper *Ueber Hartmanns von Aue Heimath und Kreuzzüge*, takes up the moot point regarding Hartmann's nativity (Lachmann, Roth, Bech, Rückert, Kurz). From passages in the *Kreuzlieder* he infers that that minstrel was a Suabian, and took part in two crusades (1189 and 1197). A. Birlinger contributes from a Bavarian MS. of the 15th century a number of curious charms to cure diseases, and W. Loose has a *Schwabenstreich* from a vol. of 1472 in the Nürnberg city library. Dr. E. Sievers finishes the first part of this number (13 papers) with a communication respecting a comparison of his *Heliand* text (Cottonianus) with Bartsch's readings, kindly undertaken by E. M. Thompson, of England, upon the request of Sievers. S. hopes that we are now in possession of a fair reading of the Cottonianus.

The second part, devoted to book notices, contains favorable criticisms of H. Osthoff's *Verbum in der Nominal-Composition im deutschen, griechischen, slavischen und romanischen*, Jena, 1878; O. Behagel's *Zeitfolge d. abhängigen Rede im deutschen*, Paderborn, 1878; Kristian Kaalund's *Bidrag til en historisktopografisk Beskrivelse af Island*, Kjöbenhavn, 1877; Henry Petersen's *Om Nordboernes Gudedyrkelse og Gudestro i Hedenold*, Kjöbenhavn, 1876; Bernhard Döring's *Bemerkungen über Stil und Typus der isländischen Saga*, Osterprogramm des Nikolaigymnasiums zu Leipzig, 1877; W. Hertz's and the late Herm. Kurz's translations of Gottfried's *Tristan und Isolde*, Stuttgart, 1877; A. Jeitteles' *Altdeutsche Predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St. Paul in Kärnten*, Innsbruck, 1878; and J. Schmidt's *Priester Konrad's deutsches Predigtbuch*, Wien, 1878.

The number closes with a report of the proceedings *Der deutsch-romanischen Abtheilung der XXXIII Versammlung deut. Philologen und Schulmänner zu Gera*, 1878; a notice by W. Hosäus of some German mediaeval MSS. in the Fürst-Georgs-Bibliothek in Dessau, and some minor communications by Möller and Barstch.

The second number begins with a paper of Felix Liebrecht, *Zur schwedischen Volksliteratur*, which adds valuable references to folk-lore not mentioned in Backström's *Öfversigt af Svenska Folkklitteraturen*, III Vol. of *Svenska Folkböcker*, Stockholm, 1845; and Fedor Bech publishes *Besserungen und Nachweise zu Müller u. Zarücke's Mhd. Wörterb., Lexer's Handwörterb.* and a number of M. H. G. texts.

Anton Nagele endeavors to show in a lengthy article *Zur Chronologie der Sprüche Walther's von d. Vogelweide*, that the accepted opinion as to the time of the origin of some of the great lyrics *Sprüche* is open to doubt; and O. Behagel continues his instructive *Beiträge zur deutschen Syntax*, discussing asyndetic constructions of which he gives a long list from the O. H. G., M. H. G., and N. H. G. to the beginning of the seventeenth century. B. subjoins a few critical remarks on readings of the M. N. L. *Osterspiel*, treated with regard to its syntax in a former number.

The discovery made some time ago in the city library at Leipzig of several parchment leaves from the fourteenth century containing fragments of Albrecht v. Scharfenberg's *Titurel*, is made the subject of a paper by G. Milchsack.

Description and text of the fragments are given. It seems that the document served as a cover for the binding of old city accounts.

Karl Bartsch in a communication notices the peculiar use of the diphthongs *ei* and *ai* in the indefinite article as it occurs in the Austrian dialect Heinrichs des Teichners (1350-77) in which the article spelt *ein* stands before accented, while *ain* generally before unaccented syllables, and concludes from it "Dass *ei* angewendet wird bei geschwächter logischer Betonung, *ai* bei betontem *ein*; dass mithin *ai* von beiden Bezeichnungen der stärkere und gewichtigere Diphthong ist."

The first part of the second number closes with minor communications from Bartsch regarding a fragment inserted on the last leaf of the Cologne MS. of Wirnts Wigalois and a Wurmsegen from a MS. in the library of Count Buoncompagni in Rome.

The book-notices commence with a criticism of W. Wilmann's Beiträge zur Erklärung und Geschichte des Nibelungenliedes, Halle, 1877, by Hermann Fischer. F., after rendering homage to the acumen displayed in the work, comes to the conclusion that he cannot agree with the results reached, and in eighty pages (including continuation in the third number of the Germania) explains his reasons for dissenting. The work goes bravely on, for surely this review of Wilmann's book shows that the end of the Kampf um der Nibelunge hort is still far off, and we may expect to see the proud array of some hundred and more gentlemen that in Germany alone have entered the lists with book and pamphlet considerably augmented. Hermann Fischer, the writer of Forschungen über das Nibelungenlied seit Karl Lachmann, Leipzig, 1874, belongs, as regards the Nibelungen question, to the Bartsch school. H. Paul has a favorable criticism of Osthoff and Brugmann's Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen, 1 Vol. Leipzig, 1878. Bartsch reviews the fourth edition of J. Grimm's Deutsche Mythologie, Berlin, 1875-78, Philipp Wackernagel's Deutsches Kirchenlied von der ältesten Zeit bis zu Anfang des XVII Jahrhunderts, 5 Vols., Leipzig, 1864-77, and Philipp Strauch's Offenbarungen der Adelheid Langmann, Klosterfrau zu Engelthal, Strassburg, 1878. H. Lambel favorably criticises L. Blume's essay, Ueber den Iwein des Hartmann v. Aue, Wien, 1879. Two extracts from a Rostock MS. of the fourteenth century finish the second number.

In the third number E. Wilken has a valuable paper on Alliteration, in which he examines at great length the accent theory in alliterative verse as treated in F. Vetter's Zum Muspilli und zur germanischen Alliterationspoesie. Wilken, although agreeing with Vetter in his opposition to the Lachmann theory, which gives to each hemistich of the Hildebrandslied four grammatical accents (applied by Mühlhoff to the rest of O. H. G. alliterative pieces), does not think that V. has succeeded in bringing conclusive proof for the two-accent theory, and holds that the fundamental questions concerning old Germanic versification are still too unsettled to admit of a positive conclusion on that score.

Under the heading Deutsche Nativität des XII Jahrhunderts, F. König presents us with the text of a fragment probably dating from the end of the twelfth or commencement of the thirteenth century, found in the Munich library, and Bartsch produces the beginning of a Margarethen-Legende found on a leaf of

the *Weltchronik* of Jansen der Enenkel in the Royal Library at Berlin. B. places the original of the legend in the twelfth century, and supplies a corrected text and remarks.

Fedor Bech follows with emendations *Zu Parzival*, and Bartsch with some verses of the twelfth century from a Munich MS.

A. Nagele continues from the second number *Zur Chronologie der Sprüche Walther's*, specially directed against Menzel's views as to the time of Walther's presence at the court of Vienna.

Adalbert Jeitteles, in referring to Birlinger's paper, *Bairische Besegnungen* (first number), furnishes texts of similar and additional matter from an Innsbruck MS. of the fourteenth century.

Hermann Fischer closes his review of Wilmann's book *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Geschichte des Nibelungenliedes*, and A. Edzardi examines Ernst Wilken's publications, *Prosaische Edda im Auszuge nebst Volsunga Saga und Nornagestháttr*, Vol. I, Text, and *Untersuchungen zur Snorra-Edda*, 1877-78, Paderborn. Edzardi's criticism of the first work is not favorable, but he finds the *Untersuchungen* "besonnener und brauchbarer."

Hugo Gering's *Finnbogasaga hins ramma*, Halle, 1879, and *Chants populaires flamands avec les airs, notés et poésies populaires diverses recueillies à Bruges*, par Adolphe Lootens et J. M. E. Feys, Bruges, 1879, are criticised favorably by Oscar Brenner and Felix Liebrecht respectively.

Otto Behagel reviews L. Bock's *Ueber einige Fälle des Conjunctivus im Mittelhochdeutschen*, Strassburg, 1878. In examining syntactical peculiarities, two modes of proceeding are possible. The first, the descriptive, notices *when* certain constructions make their appearance first; the second, the historical, shows *how* out of one construction another gradually developed, in other words, this mode traces syntactical peculiarities back to their origin. From the first standpoint Behagel thinks the pamphlet a valuable contribution; not particularly so, however, from the second, contrary to the opinion of the reviewer of the essay in the *Augsb. Allg. Zeitung*.

The third number closes with short communications from Köhler, Bartsch, Behagel, Hosäus, Birlinger and Freybe.

The fourth number begins with a paper of Reinhold Köhler, *Von den zwei Sanct Johannsen*. K. shows that the story of the two nuns quarrelling as to the greater sanctity of St. John the Baptist or St. John the Evangelist, and the subsequent vision of the two nuns as it is stated in the poem of Heinzelein von Konstanz (1298), has a corresponding narrative in the *Dialogus Miraculorum* of Cäsarius von Heisterbach (who died in the fourth decade of the thirteenth century), and there it is said to have happened in a convent of the diocese Treves. This was not known to the editors of Heinzelein (F. Pfeiffer and others). The actual stories only differ in time and circumstance of the vision, and as Heinzelein himself says:

"Daz selbe mære ist niht gestift . . .
Ich las ez eben ûz der schrift."

Köhler considers it likely that the *Dialogus* of Cäsarius is the very 'schrift' referred to by the poet. K. adds that the same story is also related of two clergymen, and in connection with it furnishes matter not heretofore noticed.

A. Nagele has additional matter in support of his views touching Walther v. d. Vogelweide and the imperial court of Vienna, treated in second and third numbers of the *Germania*, *Zur Chronologie der Sprüche Walthers*. The paper is prompted by Dr. Zarncke's essay *Zur Waltherfrage*, read before the philological division of the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences in March, 1878, and fixes the time of a certain transaction between Walther and Bishop Wolfer von Passau.

Emil Weller, in *Nachlese zu Gödekes Grundriss und Weller's Annalen*, gleans a number of poetical productions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries from Weizel's thesaurus (Leipzig, 1870), W. v. Maltzahn's library and other sources, some of which have not been known.

R. Bechstein points out a serious error of the printer in the splendid collection, *Altdeutsches Liederbuch* (Leipzig, 1877), of Franz M. Böhme, not noticed by either Schnorr v. Carolsfeld or Bartsch in their respective reviews of that work (*Archiv* 8, *Germania* 23). The well-known hymn "Warum betrübst du dich mein Herz," was formerly in all German hymn-books assigned to Hans Sachs, and in Philipp Wackernagel's *Deutsches Kirchenlied*, first edition, 1841, figured under that authorship. Goedeke, in his *Grundriss* (I, 340) first gave closer attention to this hymn, and says: "Die Ungenauigkeit der Reime weist kaum auf Hans Sachs, etc." "In seinen Handschriften ist es nicht nachgewiesen." In Koberstein, ed. Bartsch (Leipzig, 1872), I, 322, 43 it reads: "Das Lied ist jedoch wohl nicht von ihm," and P. Wackernagel, in his last edition of the *Kirchenlied*, corrects his statement in the first by placing the hymn among those of which the authorship is not known. The printer of Wackernagel's work carried the name Georgius Aemilius Oemler, which correctly headed the preceding columns, to the following containing hymns of doubtful authorship; among them the hymn in question. Böhme, led astray by this error, quotes Oemler as the author. Wackernagel, however, does note the mistake in his own book (page 1184), although not quite correctly, for instead of "Seite 123-128 sind die columnentitel zutilgen," it should read "123-130," etc. The origin of this misstatement with regard to the Hans Sachs authorship lies, according to Wackernagel, with Prof. J. M. Dilherr, of Nürnberg, who, among other errors in his hymn-book of 1654, committed this one also.

C. M. Blaas publishes a Märchen from the Bohemian Forest, *Vom unzufriedenen Wolf*, communicated to him by J. Pranzhofer, seventy-one years old, and a native of those mountains, who had heard it when a child from his grandmother. It resembles the story of the wolf's dream in J. W. Wolf's *Deutsche Hausmärchen*, but is longer and perhaps older, (cf. *Reinardus vulpes*, *Reinecke vos*).

Blaas continues with a minor paper on a passage in Konrad von Megenburg's *Buch der Natur* (ed. Pfeiffer), concerning the cuckoo's and hoopoo's companionship, which makes one think of the common saying in Low-Germany, "Der Kukuk und sein Küster," made familiar to all Germany through the line in M. Claudius' *Rheinweinlied*, "Dann tanzen auch der Kukuk und sein Küster."

Theodor Gelbe has *Ein Kinderspiel aus dem Elsas*, that in the verses chanted by the children at the play has the following:

"Sperret auf, sperret auf, die Thore auf,
Der König von Sachsen wird kommen."

G. learns that the play is much older than the present Kingdom of Saxony, and very aged persons in Strassburg maintain that the song is very old, that it reaches back several hundred years (?) A king of Saxony in the mouths of Alsatian children! Is this a reminiscence of Marshal Saxe or even of the Saxon emperors?

A. Jeitteles, from his collection of Styrian folksongs (to be published in a few years), follows with some fescennine songs in addition to those given by Liebrecht in the first number of the *Germania*, and R. Sprenger sends *Kleine kritische Beiträge zu den altdeutschen predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St. Paul in Kärnten*, (ed. Jeitteles,) zu Freidank und zur Erzählung von zwei Kaufleuten (*Zeitschrift für deut. Philologie*, VII).

Bartsch closes the first part of the fourth number with the beginning and end of a poem found among other Old-German poems in a paper MS. of the fifteenth century in the library of Lord Ashburnham, mentioned by G. Waitz, im neuen Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde. From the burthen of the beginning it seems to refer to Henry the Lion.

The book notices of the fourth number contain favorable reviews by Fedor Bech of Karl Pickel's "Das heilige Namenbuch von Konrad von Dangkrotzheim," in *Elsässische Literatur denkmäler aus dem XIV-XVII Jahrhundert*, ed. E. Martin and E. Schmidt, I Vol., Strassburg and London, Trübner; and by R. Bechstein of B. Bergemann's inaugural dissertation, *Das höfische Leben nach Gottfried von Strassburg*, Halle, 1876. Bechstein further calls attention to the excellent biographical sketch, Philipp Wackernagel, nach seinem Leben und Wirken f. d. deutsche Volk und d. deutsche Kirche, by Dr. L. Schulze, Leipzig, 1879.

The fourth number closes with a bibliographical survey, *Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie im Jahre 1878*, by Karl Bartsch in Heidelberg, assisted by K. Gislason in Kopenhagen, Möbius in Kiel and Södervall in Lund, followed by an index to the 22d, 23d and 24th Vols. of the *Germania*, and a list of contributors and their contributions for Vols. 13-24 of the *Germania*, and for Vols. I-II of the *Germanistische Studien*.

C. F. RADDATZ.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von DR. EUGEN KÖLBING. I Band. Heilbronn, 1877.¹

The editor and publishers of 'Englische Studien' issued their prospectus in October, 1876, and formulated their design with still greater exactness in the circular dated in December of the same year, and prefixed to the first number of their publication. According to this later prospectus they propose to publish

¹ In pursuance of the plan followed in the case of the 'Revue de Philologie,' and in that of the 'Anglia,' the report of Kölbing's 'Englische Studien' begins with the beginning. A summary of the several volumes of the 'Anglia' will appear in the next number.

B. L. G.

essays in English philology, whether dealing with grammar or the history of literature, unedited texts and such as might be difficult of access, communications about MSS., and the like. Besides, they announce themselves ready to accept longer articles, whether written in German, English, or French. Books, dissertations and programmes are also to be reviewed. Co-laborers are exhorted to render their assistance, that 'Englische Studien' may become at the same time a substitute for the English part of the 'Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Sprache und Litteratur,' and an independent journal of high excellence. Each volume is to contain 2-3 numbers of 10-15 sheets each, and the dates of publication will depend upon the abundance of material.

I. Of seven articles in the first number, five are furnished by the editor, the other two, Nos. 5 and 6, being by Felix Liebrecht and A. Buff respectively.

The first paper is entitled *Zur Textkritik des Ormulum*. Kölbing arrives at the conclusion that the *Ormulum* is better edited than the *Ancren Riwe*, but that a number of errors remain to be eliminated. In the course of his investigations, extending over about fifteen pages, he notes several misreadings, for the most part of minor importance, and discovers that White has sometimes mistaken a curl standing over a vowel for a regular breve, when it is in reality a distorted *æ*.

He next discusses The later English Form of the Theophilus Legend. At the beginning Kölbing refers to his article in the *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Geschichte der Rom. Poesie und Prosa des Mittelalters*, Breslau, 1876, entitled 'Ueber die englischen Fassungen der Theophilussage.' The introduction is mainly devoted to a comparison of two versions of the legend, one in Latin prose and the other in French verse, both of which were discovered by the author in the British Museum. There are three MSS. in English, Cod. Harl. 4196, Cott. Tib. E. VII, and the famous Vernon MS. The first and third of these Kölbing prints in full. The Theophilus is found to bear a marked resemblance to Hampole's *Pricke of Conscience*, in respect of metre, style and vocabulary.

The third paper, also by Kölbing, is headed *Zwei Mittelenglische Bearbeitungen der Sage von St. Patrik's Purgatorium*. There are two versions of the legend in Latin, four (possibly five) in French, and three in English. Two of the English versions are printed at length, the third and oldest having been first edited by Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden*, Paderborn, 1875. The introduction is intended as a sort of supplement to Wright's monograph on St. Patrick's Purgatory, London, 1844. An extended comparison of the various texts is made, with a view to determining the relation existing among the versions, but the results are mostly negative.

Kölbing follows with an article on the Middle English poem, *Lybeaus Disconus*. Ritson edited it for the first time in his *Metrical Romances from the Codex Cott. Calig. A. II* in the British Museum. A second copy of the poem exists in the National Library at Naples. This Naples MS. has been compared by Kölbing with Ritson's text, with the *editio princeps* of the French original (*Le bel inconnu ou Giglain, fils de messire Gauvain, par Renauld de Beaujeu*, Paris, 1860), and with the M. H. G. Wigalois (ed. Fr. Pfeiffer, Leipzig, 1847). The interdependence of the versions is investigated, and an effort made to determine the value of the Naples MS.

Kölbing next occupies about a page in pointing out the correspondence between *On god Oreisun of ure Lefdi* and the Anglo-Saxon *Phoenix*.

F. Liebrecht contributes some interesting notes on Folk-lore, under the following heads: *Godiva*, *Skimmington*, *Three souls* (*i. e.* vegetative, animal and rational), *English*, *Scottish* and *Irish superstition*, and *Kiltgang*.

The first number concludes with an article in English by A. Buff, entitled *The Quarto Edition of Ben Jonson's 'Every Man in his Humour.'* Buff's English style is clumsy and unidiomatic, and some of his sentences exhibit an open disregard of grammatical principles.

II. A. Buff opens the second number with an article of twenty-five pages in length, in which he discusses the authorship of a tract commonly ascribed to Sir Walter Ralegh, arriving at the conclusion that it was written by a certain John Keymour.

F. H. Stratmann furnishes some Emendations and Additions to the Old English Poem of 'The Owl and the Nightingale.'

E. M. Thompson supplies three Scraps from Middle English MSS., consisting of a short moral poem, the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

In an article on Chaucer's Legend of St. Caecilia (pp. 215-248), Kölbing advances the proposition that its source is not the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus a Voragine, as hitherto believed. His researches lead him to the conviction that Chaucer made use of a version, the first part of which is almost identical with the corresponding passages of the *Legenda Aurea*, while the second is much fuller and exhibits occasional discrepancies. Kölbing agrees with Ten Brink in believing that this poem (commonly known as *The Seconde Nonnes Tale*) is to be referred to the beginning of Chaucer's second, or Italian period. That Chaucer employed neither of the two English lives of the saint is the opinion of Kölbing; the text of one of them forms the second division of the article. The third part is entitled *Chaucer and Caxton*, and contains several quotations from the two works, a comparison of which leads to the following probable result: Caxton, at the time of writing his *Golden Legend* in 1483, had not only read Chaucer's poem, but was so thoroughly conversant with it that, in several places, instead of making a new translation, he availed himself of his master's phrases with entire unconsciousness that they were not his own. Kölbing closes with pointing out the necessity for a critical edition of the *Acta Sanctorum*.

J. Koch makes a valuable contribution to Chaucerian criticism. After comparing various passages of the *Knights Tale* and the *Teseide* of Boccaccio, he sums up the results as follows:

1. The description of the Temple of Venus in the Assembly of Fowles is (exclusive of the last strophes) an unmodified component of the first draft of *Palamon and Arcite*.

2. Chaucer has inserted in *Troilus and Cressida* those strophes of *Palamon and Arcite* which describe the ascension of *Arcite*.

3. Those passages of the *Knights Tale* which are most immediately dependent upon the *Teseide* are, in all probability, not borrowed directly from the latter, but from the original version by Chaucer, and may therefore pass as modified fragments of the latter poem.

The second half of the essay begins with an attempt to ascertain the chronology of certain of Chaucer's poems. 1381 is assigned as the approximate date of the Assembly of Foules, which is thereupon brought into relation with the negotiations for a marriage between Richard II of England and Anne of Bohemia. Regarding Chaucer's employment of the name Lollius, Koch is inclined to believe that it must be imputed to error or carelessness, and not be regarded as an attempt at deception or mystification. Finally, Koch would deny with Sandras, *Étude sur Chaucer*, p. 135, that Chaucer was acquainted with the Decameron of Boccaccio.

C. Horstmann prints The Vision of Saint Paul from MS. Vernon Fol. 229. This is a later form of the poem as found in MS. Laud 108, and published in Herrig's Archiv for 1873. The dialect is East Midland with Northern admixture. MS. Laud is completed, explained and corrected by the legend as contained in MS. Vernon. Horstmann also contributes The Legend of Eufrosyne, from MS. Vernon Fol. 103. His ability and minute accuracy are well known and require no comment.

Francis A. March's paper on Anglo-Saxon and Early English Pronunciation follows, being reprinted, with a note of explanation, from the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1871.

F. Bobertag contributes a long article on Fielding. His criticism is at the same time sympathetic and incisive.

Under the head of Book Notices, Albert Stimming reviews Theodor Wissmann's King Horn, originally published in Quellen und Forschungen, collected by Ten Brink, Scherer and Steinmeyer, No. XVI.

III. The third number contains, as its opening paper, an article by Francis A. March, entitled Is there an Anglo-Saxon Language? Like the paper on Anglo-Saxon and Early English Pronunciation, it is reprinted from the Transactions of the American Philological Association. Prof. March's reputation, which is deservedly high, will give his views great weight. With Grein in Anglia I he defends the use of the expression by convincing arguments.

H. Varnhagen supplies (pp. 379-423) Contributions to the Exegesis and Textual Criticism of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt. The translator has followed the French original with slavish accuracy. There are three French MSS. in the British Museum, and four prose translations into English still exist, the Ayenbite not being counted. Varnhagen's criticisms only touch the more important passages, and chiefly those contained in Mätzner's Altenglische Sprachproben.

F. H. Stratmann proposes Verbesserungen zum Havelok, to the number of nineteen.

Reinhard Mosen next discusses (pp. 425-456) Thomas Otway's Life and Works, with especial reference to the Tragedies. Eleven pages are occupied with the story of his life, and the remainder to a consideration of his Tragedies, which are taken up in the following order: Alcibiades, Don Carlos, Titus and Berenice, The History and Fall of Caius Marius, The Orphan, and Venice Preserved.

F. Bobertag contributes (pp. 456-480) a very readable article on Pope's Rape of the Lock. Alessandro Tassoni (1565-1635) created the heroi-comic poem. His *Secchia Rapita* appeared in 1616. Boileau followed with *Le Lutrin* (1672-1683), and Pope's burlesque was composed in the year 1712. Tassoni's poem is analyzed at length, and the author proceeds to consider how the new genus of poetry was established by his still greater successors, but breaks off in the middle, reserving the conclusion of his paper for another number.

Under the head of Book Notices, Karl Körner criticises Dederich's *Historische und Geographische Studien zum Angelsächsischen Beowulfliede*, (Köln, 1877), Botkine's *Beowulf* (Paris, 1876), and Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, (London, 1876). He finds that Dederich lacks thorough philological training, passes lightly over Botkine's brochure, and praises Sweet's Reader in somewhat measured terms, after criticising a few points in detail. F. Lindner notices Sattler's *Beiträge zur Englischen Grammatik*, and Fitzedward Hall on the English adjectives in *-able*, London, 1877. Kölbing reviews three recent contributions to the history of English literature: Ten Brink's admirable first volume, Morley's *First Sketch*, and Klein's *Geschichte des englischen Dramas*. O. S. Seemann follows with notices of Dowden's *Shakspeare*, a critical Study of his Mind and Art, (London, 1876), and of two German studies of Hamlet, the first by Dr. Hermann Baumgart, and the second by Dr. Heinrich von Struve. F. Bobertag reviews Albrecht Deetz's *Alexander Pope*, (Leipzig, 1876,) and Kölbing closes the Book Notices with a passing mention of *The Choice Works of Dean Swift*, (Chatto and Windus, 1876).

Among the appended Miscellanea is a brief account of Grein's useful but bitter life and the labors which made him eminent, contributed by E. Stengel, of Marburg.

ALBERT S. COOK.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, IV, I.

I. pp. 1-14. The New Fragments of Euripides and other Greek Poets, by Weil. (See report of Rhein. Museum in this Journal). (1) Cobet, in order to explain the total absence of poetical expressions in the fragment of Euripides, advances the theory that it belongs to a play based upon the occurrences of private life, and that the play, perhaps, in some scenes resembled a satyric drama. Weil takes up this theory, and after a brief discussion concludes that the present fragment is nearer the tragic than the satyric style. He then shows that it must have belonged to one of the plays known to us by name. As the fragment represents a father as annulling the marriage of his daughter, Weil shows that, while under certain circumstances that might have occurred at Rome, there is no evidence that an Athenian father had this power. Hence he infers that the father in this case exercised another power—that of king. From this, and from something which he regards as an allusion to a political offence (showing that the parties were not private citizens), and also from what he considers a threat (in the last verse) on the part of the wife and daughter to commit suicide, he concludes that the fragment belongs to a tragedy proper, which he

thinks is the *Temenidae*—a theory which he briefly defends. Then follows a discussion of the reading of a few passages in the fragment. (2) A fragment of a tragedy in the same papyrus. Discussion of the question whether the fragment is one continuous speech, or is to be divided into two. (3) Various observations on the remaining portions of the papyrus—fragment of a comedy, and two epigrams.

2. pp. 15-16. Note on the Carmen Saliare, in which L. Havet emends some of the glosses in Festus (Müller, p. 205).

3. pp. 17-24. Lectiones Xenophontaeae, by H. van Herwerden. Fifty conjectures and emendations.

4. p. 24. In Quint. X 1, 66. Thurot changes *tragœdias* into *tragœdiam*.

5. pp. 25-29. On *-que, -ve, -ne* after short *-e*, by Al. Harant. A comparison of the Latin of certain modern commentators with classic Latin will convince any one that the ancients for the most part consciously avoided this combination. Harant thinks that Quicherat is the only one who has remarked this fact. [It is quite familiar to me, and is alluded to in one of my papers read before the Phil. Association in July, 1879; but I am unable to say whence I learned it. Nearly ten years ago I saw it in the Va. Ed. Journal; but it was not new to me then. I never read Quicherat until two years ago.] Quicherat confines his observation to poets. Harant applies it to prose. [I have done the same, incidentally, for many years.] He finds no exception in Sallust, Velleius Paterculus, Q. Curtius, Pliny the Younger, Florus, Justin, Cicero (Orations), nor in Catullus, Vergil, Ovid, Phaedrus, Persius, Juvenal. In Varro the only exceptions are in quotations. In Terence one, Horace one, Caesar one, Hirtius one, Columella two, Propertius two, Tibullus three, Cato four (*benèque* four times), Nepos five, Plautus fourteen, with *elision* in nearly every instance in all these authors. The following admit it, even without elision: Lucretius twenty-seven, Aulus Gellius forty-four, Bellum Afric. twelve. When there is but one example in a large work we must suspect an error in copying. [What, then, makes the *elision* so universal? H.] The author removes all the instances from Livy but one, and that one occurs in an old formula. In the Augustan age, to judge from the authors examined, the license had virtually ceased.

6. p. 29. Note on Livy, V 42, 6, by O. Riemann.

7. pp. 30-34. King Darius' Accident (Herod. III, 129-130), by Docteur J. Geoffroy. A very acute discussion of the question whether the accident was a sprain or a dislocation, and of the exact import of several expressions in the passage.

8. p. 34. Defense of *-iere* for *-ierunt* in perfects in *-ivi*, by O. Riemann.

9. pp. 35-51. On Cic. de Finibus, by O. Nigoles. Discussion of an imperfect collation of a MS. employed by Madvig in his edition. An article of great importance for editors of this work.

10. pp. 52-58. Appointment of Athenian Archons, by Jules Nicole. M. Fustel de Coulanges maintains that the archons were from the first chosen by lot. Nicole endeavors to show that this cannot be inferred from the passages employed by F. de Coulanges, and replies to his various ingenious attempts to explain away the difficulties, and brings forward from Aristotle tolerably plain

testimony for regular election of archons in early days. He admits, however, that F. de C. has shown that choice by lot was rather aristocratic than democratic. The question when and how the choice by lot began he proposes to discuss in a future article.

11. pp. 58. Notes on Grammar, by O. Riemann. (1) Contrary to Zumpt's statement that *inferior*, *posterior*, (*superior*) always take the abl., we find *inferior quam* several times in Cicero, and *posterior quam* in Sallust (Jug. 85, 12.) In the latter example the abl., indeed, could not have been used. (2) *ὀυδέτερος* = *οὐδ' + ἕτερος* is opposed to the etymology *οὐδέεις* = *οὐ + εἰς*. (3) *τυμθησμαι* (found only twice, once in Thucyd. and once in Demosth.) is not to be rejected; for we find *τυμθη[σ]εται*, C. I. A. II 576.

12. pp. 59-67. A Friend of the Emperor Claudius, by E. Desjardins. Two sets of fragments of Latin inscriptions of the first century are put together, one set forming the first part of an inscription, and the other forming the latter part of another, a portion common to both indicating that they were in substance the same. Desjardins ingeniously restores both inscriptions, which prove to be in honor of L. Vestinus. Some interesting details.

13. pp. 67-68. A MS. of Corbie, by Omont. Rediscovery and collation of the lost MS. of No. 719 of Riese's *Anthologia Latina*.

14. pp. 69-80 with 91. On the Latin Anthology, by É. Chatelain. Origin of the so-called fragments of Gallus (Riese 914-916). Riese regrets that he admitted these into his collection, believing now with Wernsdorf that they are not ancient. Chatelain shows that they are the work of a forger of the 16th century. Then follows collation of MSS., emendations, &c., for 672, 763, 779, 788.

15. pp. 81-91. Palaeographic Notes, by Charles Graux. (1) A fragment of Sappho in Choricus. (2) Ink with metallic base in ancient times. Graux proves that the principle was known in the second century before Christ, blue vitriol being used where we use green vitriol. Many interesting details. (3) A criticism of the fac-similes of MSS. of Wattenbach and Velsen. A serious error pointed out in reference to a Florentine MS. of Plutarch. (4) Demonstration that the only remaining *bombycinus* (see report in last number) of supposed early date does not belong to the year 1095, that being the date of the original work. (5) Beautiful restoration of the most important MS. of the Greek military authors, the fragmentary Parisinus 2442 and the fragmentary Barberinus II—97 (in Rome) being found by Karl Konrad Müller to be complementary portions of one and the same MS.

16. pp. 92-7. On the Use of the Words *θέσει* and *positione* in Prosody, by Ch. Thurot. The author shows that *φύσει* and *θέσει* (*natura*, *positione*) are derived from the post-Aristotelian philosophy, and the Greek terms always retained their original meanings, while the Latin *positione* at first had this meaning, but lost it in the course of time. The article discusses the whole subject of *position* historically, showing that (as far as the author can learn) until the 10th century the *syllable* and not the *vowel* was always spoken of as being *made long*.

17. pp. 97-9. Apropos of the Auditorium Maecenatis, by G. Boissier. Mau having protested against this designation of the structure in question, and having expressed the opinion that the supposed seats were merely destined for

the reception of flower-pots, Boissier, leaving this special question to archaeologists, produces evidence that public lectures, recitations of poems, &c., were held in theatres, public or private (Hor. Ep. I 19, 41; Ov. Trist. IV 10, 55; Juv. VII 46; Sidon. II 9).

18. pp. 100-104. Supplementary to Frigell's *Collocatio codicum Livianorum*, Pars I, libros I-III continens, by O. Riemann. To be continued.

19. pp. 105-112. Book Notices, by E. C. and O. R.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ROMANISCHE PHILOLOGIE. III Band. 4 Heft.

I. Förster, W. Beiträge zur romanischen Lautlehre. *Umlaut* (eigentlich Vocalsteigerung) im Romanischen. A most important contribution to our knowledge of neo-Latin phonetics. A law of vowel change discovered similar to the *umlaut* in Zend, Keltic and German.

This study is divided into two parts, (A) *umlaut* by means of the vowel i, (B) *umlaut* by means of u. In this No. of the Zschft, A alone is taken up under the following three headings, of which No. I is treated in detail, while Nos. II, III are only sketched.

I. Influence of post-tonic on the tonic vowel, whereby the whole vowel-system is pushed up one-point on the scale. (Das eigentliche Umlautgesetz.)

II. Analogous influence of certain consonants on a preceding (tonic or pre-tonic) vowel.

III. Supplement (Vocalsenkung), i. e. Lat. ē, ō, through the influence of following i, fall one point on the vocal scale and become e, o instead of ē, ō.

Results of the investigation under I:

- | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|---------------|---------|
| (1) | Vulg. Lat. á (class Lat. ā, ă) | + i = Romance | é + i |
| (2) | " " é (" " ě) | + i = | " é + i |
| (3) | " " ē (" " ē, ĭ) | + i = | " í + i |
| (4) | " " ó (" " ò) | + i = | " ô + i |
| (5) | " " ō (" " ō, ŭ) | + i = | " u + i |

II. This consonant may be (1) a nasal, (2) palatal, (3) sibilant. (1) Fr. e + n, *cha-ine*; ð + n, Ital. *lungo*; ð + n, Ital. *cruna*; ŭ + n, Ital. *pungo*, (2) ʃ in Fr. *mouiller*, (3) *raisin*, *brebis* (?).

III. Results (1) ē + I = e; (2) ō + I = o, also ŭ + I = o. Examples (1) *fēria* = Ital. *fiēra*, (2) suffix -ōrium -ōria Fr. *gloire*
-ūrium, Dūrium = *Duero*.

II. A. von Flügel. Ladinische Liederdichter. Review of the leading characteristics of style and composition in the six poets who have given special prominence to modern Ladin literature, viz. Piderman, Sandri, Conradin von Flügel, Pallioppi, Caratsch and Caderas. The modern epoch of Ladin poetry has cut loose from the religious system of the last three centuries. The oldest member of the present school, Piderman, is chiefly known for his Folks-songs. His follower, Sandri, stuck closer to the contemplative side of poetic art, and some of his productions, especially his song, *Eu sun una giuvnetta*, became very pop-

ular. A younger contemporary of the latter, Von Flugi (1786-1874), whose poetic creations extend over more than half a century, was the Wm. Cullen Bryant of the Upper Engadine and the first of his country to *publish* a collection of his poems. Pallioppi appeared before the world as poet a couple of decades after Von Flugi, and immediately rose to the highest fame in poetic composition. As a thoroughly scientific linguist he has contributed much to our knowledge of the Ladin dialects; as a perfect master of his own idiom and controlling the most diverse forms of verse, he has shown us in his odes, sonnets and classic-verse measure the highest excellence of thought clothed in terse, pithy language, which, in many cases, can be fully appreciated only by the inhabitants of the Engadine. In 1865 two poets appeared about the same time—Caratsch and Caderas. The former is a jolly, jovial character, full of wit and humor suited almost exclusively to the modes of thought of his home-people in Upper Engadine; the latter is the Heine of E. Switzerland. Meditative, melancholy, often extremely gloomy, he represents the reflective side of the Swiss nature. He is the favorite song-writer of to-day, and his poems are characterized by their sweet melody and lucid diction. Lower Engadine has taken no part in this striking literary renaissance which is so rapidly developing in Upper Engadine.

III. *Jacobsthal, G.* Die Texte der Liederhandschrift von Montpellier H. 196. Diplomatischer Abdruck. The author is a writer on music, not a Romance scholar, and therefore gives us here nothing but an apograph of the celebrated MS. H. 196, Bibliothèque de la faculté de médecine de Montpellier. Ten pages are taken up, before starting us with the text, with numerous details about the size of the MS., the kinds of letters it contains, the signs used in writing, the relations of the musical parts, etc., etc., most of which are much more clearly and succinctly stated in Coussemaker's superb 4to vol., *L'art harmonique aux XII et XIII Siècles* (Paris, 1865), a work devoted almost exclusively to a study of this MS. from a musical point of view. In a treatise entitled *Mensuralnotenschrift des XII und XIII Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1871), Jacobsthal prepared the way for a study of the oldest musical compositions arranged for several voices (*mehrstimmige vocalcompositionen*). It is this study that he has undertaken, based upon the Montpellier MS., and confined to the influence of verse on melodic coördinations or to the articulations of melody as being of a purely technical, musical nature. It is his hope by this preliminary investigation to throw some important light on the origin of metre and rhyme, and on their intimate relations with music proper. Ten Brink and Studemund have looked through the text—a guarantee for the correctness of it wholly sufficient for special Romance students.

As nothing is said here of the particular character of this MS., it may be well to add that the discovery of it is one of the most important of modern times, not only for musical archeology but also for the literature of the middle ages. It is essentially a *codex of music*, with the regular five-line staves and heavy square notes of the old style, accompanied by interlinear texts as mentioned further on. It was written in the first half of the 14th century, is of 4to size, in vellum, and contains about 600 specimens of language, of which 130 are in Latin and the rest in *Langue d'oïl* (*i. e.* French of the north), whose

authors were mostly Trouvères of Artois, Flanders and Hainaut. The general character of these compositions is the *genre léger*, consisting of strophes and couplets, known as *pastourelles*, *motets*, *chansons*, *rondeaux* and *conduits*. It contains 330 harmonic (vocal) compositions, comprising all the various kinds of vocal music of the 12th and 13th centuries, and all of which are anterior to the last third of the 13th century. We find here 19 four-part, 245 three-part and 66 two-part pieces. Before the discovery of the MS. no four-part compositions were known. Double counter-point, known at this time under the name *repetitio diversae vocis*, was denied to the mid-age musicians by leading writers on music, (cf. Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens*, t. II, p. 381). Here we have three most important examples of considerable length in this sort of musical composition. The Trouvères were regarded only as *mélodistes* (inventors of melody); they are here shown to have been also *harmonistes* (authors of several-part pieces). The MS., moreover, enables us to present a complete work on the origin and first developments of harmony. In the above-mentioned treatise by Coussemaker, he gives us only 51 extracts from the language of the Codex. It is, therefore, a source of congratulation to Romance scholars that they are soon to have the texts in their entirety laid before them in J.'s faithful word-for-word copy.

This MS. belonged originally to the celebrated MS. collection of Bouhier, president of the Dijon parliament († 1746), was first mentioned in *Journal des Savants* for 1842, but its contents not known till 1851, through the distinguished labors of the renowned Théodore Nisard (L'abbé Théodule Normand).

MISCELLANEOUS.

I. *Coronini, K. Graf*. Ueber eine Stelle in Dante's Inferno, (I 28, 29.) According to C. *Ripresi via per la spiaggia* means, that the poet started off on level ground. This, however, is in direct contradiction to the following verse, on which v. 29 depends, and which explains the *mode* of the action, *Si ch'è piè fermo sempre era'l più basso*. Now, if the words *più basso* mean anything at all, they must refer to one foot being lower than the other during the act of walking. Such thing is inconceivable on a perfectly level plain; besides, verses 13, 14 represent the poet *arrived* (*giunto*) already at the foot of a hill, and v. 31 confirms the idea that he had *actually begun* to mount—(ed ecco, *quasi al cominciare dell'erta*). This new-fangled exegesis is absurd when the situation is carefully considered; the usual one, that the poet is *ascending* the slope, is common sense. Let us stick to it.

II. *Suchier, H.* Zu den 'Mariengebeten.' The learned linguist, Madam Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos proposes a few emendations to S.'s work bearing the above title (Halle, 1877), published in O. Fr., Provençal and Old Portuguese texts. Gröber in his criticism of this work had suggested *ainda* for *ainda*, line 25. Madam de V. adds *ata* for *ate*, l. 5.; *soon* for *soou*, l. 15, as being the genuine O. Portuguese forms.

III. *Förster, W.* Romanische Etymologien (fortsetzung). Comprises Nos. 13-24 inclusive of a series of Etymologies begun in *Zschft III 2*. D. S. and L., found below, stand for Diez, Scheler and Littré respectively.

(1) *Encentar* Sp. = insectare from insecō (D. inceptare). (2) *meuble* Mod.

Fr. = originally *mōvilis*, from which, by contraction comes the vulg. Lat. *mō(v)bilis*. (D. S. L. *mōbilis*.) (3) *Lóbrego* Sp. = *lūbricus* (D. *lugubris*, with transposition). (4) *Nata* (cream) Sp. = *matta*, *i. e.* a covering (D. *natare*, 'das schwimmende'). (5) *Hoto* O. Sp. (surety, certainty) = *fultus*, vulg. Lat. *folium*: vocalization of *l* gives Port. *foto*, Sp. *hoto*. (D. *fotus*, 'gepflegt'). (6) *Froisser* Mod. Fr. = *frustum* (first suggested by L.) whence Schuchardt got his type-form *frustiare*. The claims of S. ('Anhang,' 59), and also those in Romania III, 328, to being the original proposers of this etymology are false. (7) *Andare* Ital. = *vadere* through Sardin. *vandare*: hence the mixture of Ital. conjugation *andare* with the Lat. *vadere*. *Ambulare* is an impossible etymon phonetically; *addere* improbable in meaning. (8) *Eito* Port. = *actum*: cf. *peito* = *pactum*. (9) *Cruus* O. Fr. = *crudōsum*, not *cruels*, through vocalization of *l*. (10) *Maquiller* Mod. Fr. = O. Fr. *masquillier* from *maschera*. (S.'s *maca* does not exist; L. suggests nothing; D. does not treat the word.) (11) *Putto* Ital. = *pūtidus*; all R. L.'s attach *bad* meaning to this word. Ital. alone has also a good one: orig. signification must, therefore, have been *bad* (D. S. L. *pūtus*). (12) *Nocchiere* Ital. = *navicularius* for Sp. and Ital. forms. *Navicularius* and *naclerus* must both be rejected for Fr. and Prov., which come, perhaps, from an old word found in inscriptions, *nauticarium*.

IV. *Tobler, A.* Romanische Etymologien. Six numbers: (I) *Otage* Mod. Fr. = O. Fr. *ostage*, derivative from *oste* (*hospitem*) with the original meaning of *hostage*. There are two objections to *obsidaticum* as etymon, (1) passage of *d* into *t*. (2) Inexplicable how the R. L.'s fell upon a derivative, not present in Lat., from a word which never belonged to them. (II) *Cuisençon* O. Fr. = *conquisitionem* (*aufsuchung*), from which vulg. Lat. probably has a form *conquins'tione*. (D.'s Provençal *cozensa* not tenable). (III) *Banquet* Mod. Fr. = dimin. of *ban* (originally *banc*), the bans (*aufgebot*), then a feast (*gastgebot*). (IV) *Malade* Mod. Fr. = *male habitus* (cf. *cornu* Roman III, 377), etymon supported by verbal derivatives from *malabitus* through the suffix *ic*. *Malabit'jare* gives us Prov. *malavetjar*, *malavejar*. From the verb comes the subst. *malavei*, *malavech*. From the adj. *malaute* comes *malautejar* just as O. Fr. *maladiier* from *malade*. (V) *Fandonia* Ital. = O. Fr. *fantosme* (*phantasma*): original *nt* became *nd* (*fregonde*, *frequentum*). Examples cited where the O. Fr. form has the same sense as the Italian (*bugia*, *favola*). (VI) *Deslear* Prov. = same meaning as O. Fr. *sei desleier* (Benoit, Wace), 'to break the law': occurs only twice and both times reflexive. [D.'s meaning, 'defame' (in Verruf bringen), not tenable.]

A. M. ELLIOTT.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, XXXV, I.

I. pp. 1-38. Date of the Founding of Rome, by G. F. Unger. A long and torturing discussion of the most minute particulars, divided as follows: (1) Gründungsdata der vulgären Jahrrechnung. (2) Gründungsdata der wahren Zeitrechnung. (3) Mythisch-mystische Data. The article is of great importance for investigators of the subject, but for all others it is very uninviting; and yet it contains, here and there, isolated facts of great interest. One of

the chief objects is to show that 190 years (the assumed duration of one generation) enters directly or indirectly as a factor into most of the prehistoric periods according to the Romans.

2. pp. 39-55. On the Genuineness of the Phoenix of Lactantius, by Hermann Dechent. After alluding to the views of Riese and others, the author discusses: (1) the sources; (2) the relations of the author of the Phoenix to Christianity; (3) the question who that author really was. He shows that the author draws many of his ideas from the Bible, and that he views many things from the Christian standpoint. He also points out many correspondences between the poem and the prose works of the Christian father Lactantius, and concludes that he was the author. The article closes with an explanation of the passages which seem to indicate a heathen author, and a discussion of the exact date of the composition.

3. pp. 56-68. Contributions to the History of Greek Literature, by A. Daub. Article based on Suidas and Eudokia, comprising the following heads: (1) The historian Damastes and the sophist Polos. (2) Remarks on the life and writings of Pamphila. (3) On the writings of the rhetor Leon of Alabanda and the sophist Leon of Byzantium. (4) A work of the grammarian Diogenian. (5) Two works of Ephoros. (6) On the title of a work of Nikolaos Damaskenos. (7) Sopatros the comedian and Sopatros the *παρωδός*. (8) On some comedies of Sannyrion. (9-15) Emendations to Suidas.

4. pp. 69-73. Glossemata Latina, by Bücheler. A discussion of certain points connected with the book of Martyrius on B and V (Keil, *grammat. lat.* VII, p. 165 ss.), with brief discussion of Umbrian *buf kaleduf* and Oscan *casmar*.

5. pp. 74-97. New Fragments of Euripides and other Greek Poets (Blass) with a supplement (Bücheler). Weil has published (with partial photographs) a papyrus, written on both sides. On the front side is found: (1) 44 iambic trimeters of a lost play of Euripides; (2) 46 other trimeters by another hand; (3) by still another hand, some accounts of things delivered to the *Δίδυμοι* in the Serapeum at Memphis. The other side contains: (1) a second copy of the same fragment of Euripides, by another hand; (2) 20 elegiac verses. The accounts with the *Δίδυμοι* fix the date with some certainty at B. C. 161. The article before us then gives: (1) the text of the fragment of Euripides as restored by Weil and further improved by Blass, with MS. readings, and a discussion of Weil's views as to the proper location of the fragment (Eur. Temenidai); (2) a similar treatment of the remaining 46 trimeters which include (a) 8 verses, (5-13) of the Medea; (b) 23 trimeters of a lost tragedy, metre Aeschylean; (c) 15 trimeters of a lost comedy; (3) the epigrams, two of ten verses each, which are assigned in the MS. to Poseidippos. The fragment of 44 trimeters is assigned by the papyrus to Euripides, and the versification seems to corroborate that authorship. Some of these fragments are almost hopelessly corrupt, apparently from ignorance of Greek on the part of the copyists.

6. pp. 98-104. In Herodianum Technicum Critica (edidit Petrus Egenolff). Dindorf's edition of Herodianos' work *περὶ μνημονικῆς λέξεως* is based upon a copy of the MS. made by O. D. Bloch, and after him no one examined the MS. (cod. Hauniensis, n. 1965). The article points out a vast number of instances

in which the MS. is misquoted. In one instance (9, 21) Bloch conjectured *είπερ*, which was exactly the MS. reading before him!

7. pp. 105-9. On the Letters of Seneca, by O. Ribbeck. Contributions to the purification of the text.

8. pp. 110-130. Description of Statues by Christodoros and Pseudolibanios, by Konrad Lange. This article is exceedingly interesting for archaeologists. The author shows that in the *ἐκφράσεις* of the above writers, the statues were, in many instances, entirely misunderstood and falsely named. A mere abstract of this article could be of but little interest.

9. pp. 131-151. When was the Phaidros of Plato composed? by H. Usener. The author corrects the false reading in Laertios Diogenes III, 38 (*λόγον* into *λόγος*) with MSS., and so removes much of the weight of this testimony for the early composition of the Phaidros; and, on the other hand, he maintains that the testimony of Cicero (Orat. 13, 42) for late composition is of little value. But the date can be fixed without direct testimony. The allusion in the work to Isokrates as being *ἐτι νέος* shows that it was written at an early date. The favorable character of the prophecy in this passage shows that it was not made *ex eventu*; for after Isokrates published his oration against the Sophists, Plato was no longer his friend. A close scrutiny of these facts with what is known of the movements and doings of Plato and Isokrates, places the composition of the Phaidros between 403 and 399. A thorough discussion of the relations to each other, and the pursuits, etc., of Lysias, Isokrates, and others, with the aid of allusions to Lysias in the Phaidros, narrows the date down to 403 or the early half of 402.

10. pp. 152-156. Miscellaneous. (1) On Aristotle, by N. Wecklein. Half-dozen emendations and conjectures to the Rhetoric. (2) C. Vibinius Rufinus, by Jos. Klein. An inscription found at Mainz, last summer, enables us to fill a gap in the list of imperial legates in upper Germany: *C. Vibinius Rufinus*, A. D. 42-45.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

PHILOLOGUS: ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DAS KLASSISCHE ALTERTHUM, herausgegeben von ERNST VON LEUTSCH. Göttingen, 1879. Vol. XXXVIII, 3d and 4th Parts.

The delay in the coming forth of these parts has been caused, we are sorry to see by the note on p. 855, by the illness of the editor.

The 4th part, pp. 585-778, is taken up by the 2d and concluding part of Boysen's Bibliographic Survey of Greek Literature from 1867 to 1876. Beginning with Horapollon it goes to Zosimus. It will, of course, be very useful to Greek students, and seems, in the main, full and accurate. The titles of some American editions are, however, left out, a common fault in German bibliography.

Of long essays in these two parts, there are four: by Ahrens, on an Olympian Inscription; by Eichhorst, on the Discussion of the Article by Apollonios Dyscolos; by Unger, on the Attic Archons from Ol. 119, 4 to 123, 4; and by Herbst, on the time of Thucydides' composition of the earlier books of his history.

In textual criticism there are conjectural emendations to Seneca and to Valerius Flaccus in Latin, and to Euripides in Greek.

In Seneca, de Tranq. An. 2, 6 (not 2, 5 as printed), Eussner changes *parum leves* into *pariter leves*, a change that seems to remove a clear thought in order to make room for an obscure one. He is more fortunate in 10, 3; here he points out the shattered condition of the antithesis *aliorum aurea catena est, aliorum laxa est*, and proposes to restore it by reading *atque laxa*. The fault is obvious here, and the conjecture reasonable.

In Valerius Flaccus, Köstlin makes a fresh attack upon the difficult passage in VII, 55, seq. By changing the *aut ego* or *haud ego* of the text, v. 57, into *quamque ego* he works out an altogether different thought. The change is violent, and the thought thus secured does not seem so fit as that of Nisard's text.

In Euripides, Wecklein brings forward a number of conjectures, the fruit of sound sense and of careful reading of his author.

In Heracl. 906-909 (Nauck), he changes τῶν ἀδίκων παραιῶν | φρονήματος ἀέλ into φρονήματ' ἐς ἀέλ. The sense thus gained is clear and strong, but the notion of a gradual humiliation, as expressed in the text, seems more in accord with the context. Has this change ever been proposed before? It is curious that the common English translation by Buckley, published in 1854, is an exact rendering of Wecklein's conjectural reading.

In Iphig. A. 1002 seq., he changes ἱκετεύοντες ἤξετε into ἱκετέοντε θ' ἤξετε. Neither the use of the masc. pl. for the fem., nor the simple τε without correlative in 1003 is sufficient warrant for this change.

The comparison of Fr. 977 (955 in Wagner) ἀφονον σπέρμα with ἀραιον-γένος of Hipp. 1415, is ingenious and convincing. It gives the probable source of the fragment, and points to a change made in the text by the poet himself, under hostile criticism.

In Fr. 1039 (875 in Wagner), he changes ἐξωθέν τις ἐσσι into ἐξωθεν τίθησι. This is pleasing and plausible: yet the text is not so difficult as to make any change necessary. The real difficulty of the text, as felt by Halm, the absence of the exclamatory ὥς in the 2d line, is not touched by this conjecture.

By comparison between Xen. Symp. VIII 34 and Plat. Symp. 182, A., and between Xen. VIII 23 and Plat. 181, B., Rettig seeks to prove, in addition to other proofs already brought forward by him, that the Symposium of Xenophon was written before that of Plato. The coincidences here are too slight and the argument on them too thin to help a conclusion that seems on other grounds certain.

The elaborate essay of H. L. Ahrens on a lately-discovered Olympian Inscription, edited by Kirchhoff and numbered 111, is of great interest. Besides many acute remarks of high authority on questions of Elean dialect, it contains an ample discussion of a large class of Greek words and a new theory of their etymology. As for the inscription itself, it cannot be held that either Kirchhoff or Ahrens has succeeded in bringing it into readable shape. Whatever allowance we moderns may make for the intellectual power of the average Greek, no Greek, without the suggestions and explanations of modern philology, could have made out the recondite meaning that is read into the mutilated stones by modern professors. Yet each step of the discussion is full of knowledge and of

sagacity. *Χαλαδριοι* for *Χαλαδρίοις* is reasonably interpreted as name of the people of a place in Elis, *Χαλάδρα* for *Χαράδρα*, not heretofore known to geographers. *συλαι* as dialectic form of optative of *συλάω* is rejected in favor of *συλαίη*. The interpretation of *μεδαμοι δοκεοι* by Kirchhoff as *μετὰ δάμω δοκέοι* is justly rejected as impossible syntax; and *με* for *μή* is defended as possible in the Elean dialect instead of *μά*. The omission of the article before *δάμω*, as the official designation of the people, is justified by the usage of inscriptions. *Φερεν* is plausibly explained as ancient digammated form of *ἐρρειν*; but the phrase thus constructed by Ahrens *ἐρρειν πρὸς Δία*, as form of outlawry, is, we think, improbable and false. But the gist of the essay lies in the interpretation of the word *Φατρα* for *ρήτρα* as 'agreement, treaty,' and in the etymology brought forward to support this meaning. Into connection with this word and this meaning he seeks to bring *ρήσις* (cf. Hom. Od. φ. 290), *ρητός* (cf. Hom. Il. φ. 455), *εἰρημένος* (cf. Thuc. I 140), *ρήσασθαι* wherever used, and finally *εἰρήνη* itself. All these words he seeks to detach from the root *ῑρ* or *ῑερ* (to speak), cf. Curtius Gr. Et. p. 320 seq., and to derive from a root *ῑραF* or *ρα*, meaning to *cease*. This root he considers synonymous with *παυ*, and cognate with O. H. G. *raiva* (rest). To illustrate the development of meaning, he traces the Latin *pax* = *εἰρήνη*, through *paciscor*, back to root *pac* or *pakv* identical with the root of *παύω*, and compares Greek *πάξ* with interjectional use of Latin *pax*. The argument is here in many places very thin, and we may still prefer the development of all the words in question from the root *ῑερ* (speak). But the discussion of the passages, as they occur, is of the deepest interest, and the argument against the accepted etymology of *εἰρήνη*, apparently accepted by Curtius himself, is of the greatest power. Very convincing, especially, is the interpretation of the Cretan *Ὁράτριος Ζεύς* as *ῑράτριος Ζ.* (*ο* for *F*), as the god that presides over treaties of peace.

Eichhorst discusses (pp. 398-422) the treatment of the Article by Apollonios Dyscolos. After regretting the loss of Apollonios' special treatise, he gives in clear and interesting outline the views of that grammarian, as given in the 1st book of his syntax, on the uses and classification of the article. The essay is full of curious facts, and brings out into clearness the strange union of childish simplicity with profound penetration that marked the work of the Greek grammarians. The name *τὸ ἄρθρον*, derived from *ἀρτάω*, was defined by Apollonios as that which was *fastened on to the case*, *πάντοτε ἐναρμόνιον πτωτικῷ*. Aware of the connection between article and pronoun, he tries first to distinguish the one from the other. How imperfectly he succeeded in doing this is proved by the fact, so prolific of syntactical confusion, that he claims for the article, as distinct from the pronoun, two forms: *ὁ, ἡ, τό* and *ὃς, ἣ, δ* (Relative). To these two, as one part of speech, he assigns the 4th place among the parts of speech, after the Participle and before the Pronoun. His reasons for giving it this particular place are a quaint illustration of the grammatical reasoning of the time (cf. p. 401). His next care is, as against Tryphon, to prove by a long argument that *ὦ*, as prefix of the Vocative, is not a form of the article. Never probably were so many reasons, good and bad, brought forward to prove so clear a point. Later on, a similar argument is constructed to demonstrate that the *δ* in *ὁποῖος* is not an article. The essential characteristic of the article he finds in its power of *ἀναφορά* or *ἀναπόλησις*, that is, 'of bringing back before the mind the

conception of some 3d person already mentioned.' By this, the person or thing named at first without article acquires the article when it appears again in the discourse. Here, although expressed in strange form, there is a sagacious grasp of that defining power of the article which is the basis of our modern treatment. From this he proceeds to a classification of the article's uses: 1st, *κατ' ἐξοχήν* as *ὁ ποιητής* for Homer; 2d, *κατὰ μοναδικὴν κτῆσιν* as the expression of possession; 3d, *καθ' ἀπλὴν ἀναφοράν*, to define the thing as already mentioned. In his illustrations he gives discussion to many delicate points of usage that still have importance for modern grammarians. From the *ἀναφορά* he explains the absence of the article in *ὅσο ἄνθρωποι*, and its presence in *ἀμφότεροι οἱ ἄνθρωποι*. He explains the familiar difference between *ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος* and *τὸ Ἀρίσταρχος*. He upholds the two meanings of the attributive participle, *ὁ τυραννοκτονήσας*, in such a way as to show that he anticipated modern grammarians in distinguishing the generic article from the individual. He argues, again against Tryphon, that in the articular Infinitive the article does not change the nature of the Infinitive itself. Here his argument, clear and strong, is still worthy of careful study. He lays down the rule for the use of the article with the Partitive Genitive, and points out the double irregularity of Homer's *Νεστωρίδαι* II. XVI 317. From this idea of the divided whole, he draws with beautiful simplicity the rule, so often misstated even now, for the use of the article with *ἄλλος*. In discussing these and many other points, his ample knowledge and clear perceptions make his remarks very weighty. We are glad to see that Dr. Eichhorst promises another paper on this subject.

Unger discusses at great length (pp. 423-502), the order and exact dates of the Attic Archons from Ol. 119, 4 to Ol. 123, 4. The essay is worked up chiefly from the newly discovered inscriptions that have added so much to our knowledge of this obscure period. From these, by very intricate combinations of chronology, Unger seeks to clear up several disputed points of history, and especially to fix the principle according to which the leap-years came in the Attic calendar. The calculations are so complicated, and the results so many and so minute, as to be unfit for abstract.

Herbst, in a long article (pp. 502-584) of extraordinary power, discusses and determines, as we think, the time at which Thucydides composed those books of his History that narrate the war down to Nikias' peace. Ullrich, more than thirty years ago, put forward the theory that these earlier books were written during the years of that peace, and written, of course, in ignorance of the later phases of the war. Against this theory, which has been accepted by many scholars, Herbst argues here with such force of reasoning as, we think, to close the question. According to him, the great war, although conceived and narrated by Thucydides, as a whole, was divided for convenience' sake into three parts: 1st, the ten years' war down to the peace of Nikias; 2d, the period of latent war while the nominal peace lasted; 3d, the period from the fresh outbreak to the end.

But although Thucydides thus divided the one war into three periods, he composed his whole history in the years that followed the close of the twenty-seven years of war. Right at the beginning, in the first sentence of the first chapter, he announces his intention of narrating the whole war. But from the 2d Book on to the 23d chapter of the 4th Book, he treats of the Ten Years' War

as a separate part of the whole, so that within these books the words *ὁ πόλεμος* or *ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος* refer not to the whole, but to this part. Even, however, in narrating these ten years, he shows in many ways a full knowledge of the seventeen years that came afterward, and he conceives of all the events of the earlier period in their relation to the events of the later periods. These are the final results of the essay (cf. pp. 534, 545, 583), and they are attained by a most brilliant analysis of the narrative itself and of the peculiar Thucydidean diction. The almost faultless argument is of necessity so complex, and it depends so much upon the accumulation of details, that it cannot be abridged. Nowhere, not even in Classen, have we seen a more exact and comprehensive knowledge of the usages of Thucydides' style. Especially to be noted in his discussion of the crucial passage in II 1, init. is his convincing argument against Classen that the famous *ἐν ᾧ* is not to be taken in a conjunctive sense but as an ordinary definite relative to the antecedent *πόλεμος*. From here on he analyzes with unflinching accuracy all the passages in which the historian shows, in telling the earlier events of the war, his full knowledge of all the later events. Of the linguistic facts brought to light, perhaps the most important are the distinction made by Thucydides between *οὗτος ὁ πόλεμος* and *ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος* in the distinctly subjective character of the latter (— this war that I am relating), and the distinction made between *ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος* and *ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε*, by the presence in the former of a distinct antithetic reference. After finishing this minute analysis of separate passages, Herbst rises into a masterly criticism of the historical method of Thucydides and to an eloquent estimate of the intellectual power of the great historian, pp. 566 seq. Especially original and useful is his theory of the relation between the speeches and the narrative parts of the history. All tends to a triumphant vindication of the unity of the work: every detail shows that Thucydides in composing every sentence calculated its references both to what preceded and to what was to follow.

THOMAS R. PRICE.

LANX SATURA.

In the dedication of a work crowned by the Berlin Academy occur the following bits of Latinity, which are evidently due to the influence of the Greek authors, with whom the successful essayist seems to be only too familiar. Or perhaps, as Lucullus deliberately barbarized his Greek (Cic. ad Att. I 19, 10) to show that his work was a Roman's, so our writer purposely neglects normal Latin to show himself a Grecian. Else what good warrant for—

Interim *me* ut periculum facerem facile persuasisti (*ἐπεισάς με*)

Memineris velim *quod* (*μνησθαι ὅτι*) haud raro sum expertus?

LUDI MAGISTER.

An esteemed correspondent, very much dissatisfied with results obtained by teaching ancient Greek through modern, writes to ask whether this is really the most excellent way. This is a pedagogical rather than a philological question, and cannot be answered categorically without doing injustice to some teachers.

who are profoundly versed in both languages, or, to make every conceivable concession, in both dialects. It may be said, however, that a Greek of to-day is more apt to fall into certain errors than one who approaches immediately the classic tongue. So even an imperfectly trained Hellenist would hardly be guilty of calling the style of the extant fables of Aesop "perfect," nor would he say that they "abounded in all the idiomatic usages of the Attic dialect." He would not select the Septuagint as a model on which to base conversational exercises. He would not use *ὅστις* for *ὅς*; he would have some notion of the limits of *οὐ* and *μή*; he would not prefer *κελεύω* with the dative nor *φημί* with *ὅτι*; he would not indulge in *μήποτε* *γενοῦ* nor in *ἤρνησας*. In short, he would avoid a number of the mistakes into which Professor Timayenis¹ has fallen by over-familiarity with the current language. To be sure, this negative advantage would be outweighed by the consideration that the modern Greek has by an unparalleled miracle preserved the genuine pronunciation intact, whereas English in a few centuries has drifted far from the original utterances; and by the further consideration that almost every schoolboy has occasion to visit the Levant frequently in the course of an ordinary life, while an accurate knowledge of the ancient tongue is a secondary matter in education. But, as I said before, that is a pedagogical question upon which this journal cannot enter.

There is no more dangerous amusement than one to which certain Dutch critics are very much addicted. I do not object to their scribbling on the margins of their editions of classic authors. That is comparatively harmless, and sometimes good may come of it. Indeed, every scholar has more than once found a decided advantage in the freshness of vision, which is thus fixed by a marginal note. But it is little short of a crime to gather up these notes in a drag-net and dump them out without any subsequent revision. A notion, which may seem very happy at the time, often turns out to be a most infelicitous blunder. Mehler, one of the contributors to the *Mnemosyne*, sometimes indulges in this national pastime of fishing up conjectures with very poor results. Among other examples of piscatory art (*Mnemosyne* VI 4, p. 388), which I used some months since as warnings to young critics, is his emendation of *Iliad* B, 291, a difficult passage:

ἢ μὴν καὶ πόνος ἐστὶν ἀνιηθέντα νέεσθαι

With a whoop of exultation which would do credit to a Comanche, Mehler writes:

ἀνιηθέντ' ἀνέχεσθαι,

which never occurred to any of the great critics, simply because the great critics knew their syntax too well to combine *ἀνέχεσθαι* with an aorist participle.

Again, in *Lucian's Vera Historia* A, 22: *διὰ τούτων δ' ἐχέουσιν καὶ πλησιάζουσι ταῖς ἐαυτῶν γαμέταις* (*sic*) Mehler proposes *οὔρουσι*; not so bad, if *Lucian* were not in the habit of doubling. But it is diverting to notice that Mehler writes four times *ταῖς γαμέταις* with wrong accent and wrong gender. In his exceeding desire to be clever he has forgotten the story: *γάμοις γὰρ τοῖς ἄρρεσι χρῶνται κτέ.* So much for his acquaintance with an author whom he calls *veteres deliciae meae*. In *V. H. B* 45 Mehler desires to change *φέρουσι* into *φύουσι*. If any change is needed, *φοροῦσι* would be more natural, but here *φέρουσι* might very

¹ *Aesop's Fables*, etc. By T. T. Timayenis. Boston: John Allyn. 1879.

well stand, even according to Cobet's dictum: *φέρειν* dicimur *onera* et quidquid pondus habet. The fun would consist in lugging these parts of the body not as members but as instruments. Another specimen of Mehler's familiarity with his *veteres deliciae* is shown by his note on Hermot. 1, ἀθλιον εἶναι ἐν τῷ πολλῷ τῶν ιδιωτῶν συρφετῷ παραπολλόμενον (so the best reading: M. has παραπολούμενον) ἢ εὐδαιμονῆσαι φιλοσοφῆσαντα. For παραπ. M. would read περιπολοῦντα: Beatus est qui inter philosophos versatur, infelix non is qui ἐν τῷ πολλῷ ιδιωτῶν συρφετῷ παραπολεῖται sed qui inter incultam profanamque plebem versatur. On which it may be remarked that the misfortune consists in wasting one's life in the midst of such a rabble—cf. Epicur. ap. Stob. Flor. 16, 28: ὁ δὲ πάντων βίος μελλήσμευ παραπλύνεται, and Luc. himself Anach. 13 (II 891); and Mehler has forgotten—dare I say that he had not yet read?—what Lucian says below, p. 61, ἐν τῷ συρφετῷ παραπολεῖσθαι (better παραπολέσθαι). At least he has not touched the latter passage. I do not think, then, that περιπολοῦντα is anything but an idle notion, which should have been dismissed as soon as formed: but I would not object to παραπολλόμενον.

"Mr. Paul Drysen proposes to present to the American reader one of the most famous works of antiquity: the Greek Anthology. . . . Their fourteen hundred short poems or epigrams . . . have been translated in the metres of the originals: copious explanatory notes have been added. . . . The author thinks that the time has come to publish what he has so far achieved," (the Sepulchral and Erotic and Dedicatory Epigrams), and issues a circular inviting subscriptions. Few teachers will perhaps be able to pay \$10 for a translation of a part of the Greek Anthology, but it is to be hoped that when Mr. Paul Drysen, 267 Seventh Avenue, New York, publishes his work, he will not deal too severely with those journalists who illustrate their pages by specimens of what he has so happily called his "profitable but not lucrative toil." It has been a difficult task to choose among the samples arrayed in his circular. Besides, our more critical readers may object to any space thus given up to merely literary matters, and, if Mr. Drysen did not promise us "original philological researches" in his forthcoming work, it might be necessary to apologize for this gratuitous notice. Still, room must be made for just one:

Κριναγόρου.

ἀργύρεόν σοι τόνδε, γενέθλιον ἐς τεὸν ἡμᾶρ
 Πρόκλε, νεόσμηκτον δουρατίνῃ κάλαμον,
 εὖ μὲν ἐνσχίστοισι διάγλυπτον κέρασσαν,
 εὖ δὲ ταχνομένην εὐροον ἐς σελίδα
 πέμπει Κριναγόρης, ὀλίγην δόσιν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ θυμοῦ
 πλείονος, ἀρτιδαεῖ σύμπνοον εὐμαθίῃ.

CRINAGORAS.

Proclus, to-day's thy birthday; allow me to send thee the silver
 Pen enclosed as a gift. 'Tis an elastic, but strong,
 Bright but durable pen, with cleverly sharpened points, well
 Able to run at full speed over many a page.
 Please accept it. Crinagoras sends this trifle. Perhaps it
 Will in thy newly-acquired art be of service to thee.

Classical scholarship permeates every department of English literature, from *Paradise Lost* to Pinafore. So some one has detected in the song of the Ruler of the Queen's Navee a reference to Plaut. *Asin.* 2, 4, 20: *iussin in splendorem dari bullas has foribus nostris?*

À propos of Professor Allen's useful little book, 'Remnants of Early Latinity,' just published by Ginn & Heath, Boston, it may be interesting to note that M. Bréal, at a recent meeting of the French Institute (Jan. 30, 1880), presented a paper on the ancient Latin text, known as the 'Song of the Arval Brothers.' According to the *Revue Critique* (Feb. 9), M. Bréal remarks that the text is preserved for us by an inscription of the time of the Emperor Heliogabalus, which forms part of the proceedings of the fraternity of the twelve Arval Brothers, reorganized under the empire. The text is given as having been sung at a ceremony in May of the year 218, by the twelve Arvals, who read the text of it from little books, *libelli*, prepared beforehand. It is from one of these *libelli* that the text was copied on the marble slab, which has preserved it for us. M. Bréal thinks that the books themselves had been copied from an ancient inscription preserved in the archives of the fraternity. The inscription dated back probably to the second century before our era, which explains the mixture of archaic and modern forms found in it; for example *lases*, for the classic *lares*, alongside of *incurrere*, where we find *r* in place of *s* between two vowels. Finally, the ancient Latin of this song was not at all understood by the copyists of the time of Heliogabalus, who grossly corrupted the text. The song consists of five verses, which, in the inscription of the archives of the brothers, were probably each written once. In the text which has come down to us, however, each is repeated three times, and the word *triumpe*, which comes after the last verse, is repeated five times. Now the fourth of these verses thus repeated did not, according to M. Bréal, originally form part of the song, but was an indication of the established order, marking an action to be performed by the Arval Brothers at that point of the ceremony. It was then through mistake that the copyists of the year 218 repeated this verse also three times, and that the Arvals sang it as the rest. The song is only a litany, in which invocation is made for the prosperity of agriculture, to a number of gods of ancient Italy; the *Lares*, *Marmar* or *Mamers* (the Oscan Mars), the Latin *Mars*, *Berber* (perhaps still another reading of the name of Mars), and the *Semones* or gods of the seed-time. M. Bréal gives the following reading and translation of this text:

ENOS (cor. ENOM) LASES IVVATE.
 NEVE LVE RVE (cor. ARVE) MARMAR SINS (var. SERS, cor. SEIRIS) INCVRRERE. INPLEORES (lacuna?).
 SATVR FVFERE (cor. SATA TVTERE) MARS. LIMEN SALI (cor. CLEMENS SATIS) STA BERBER.
 SEMVUNIS ALTERNEI ADVOCAPIT CONCTOS.
 ENOS MARMOR IVVATO.
 TRIVMPE.

This becomes in classic Latin:

"Eia! Lares, juvate. Neve luem arvis, Marmar, siveris incurrere. Impløres . . . Sata tutere, Mars. Clemens satis sta, Berber. Semones alterne invocabit cunctos. Eia! Marmar, juvato. Triumphe."

In the expression *clemens satis sta*, the word *sta* is to be taken in the sense of *be*: "be thou favorable to the crops, Berber!"

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

AMERICAN.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

Allen (F. D.), *Remnants of Early Latin*. Boston, *Ginn & Heath*, 1880. 106 pp. 85 c.

Bell (A. M.), *Second Greek Reader*. New York, *Macmillan*, 1879. 16mo, 295 pp. (Clarendon press ser.) \$1.

Bender (Hermann), *Brief Hist. of Roman Literature*; tr. and ed. by E. P. Crowell and H. B. Richardson. Boston, *Ginn & Heath*, 1880. 152 pp. \$1.05.

Campbell (Lewis), *Sophocles*. New York, *Appleton*, 1880. 157 pp. 60 c.

Davies (B.), *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*; rev. by E. C. Mitchell, D. D. Andover, *Warren F. Draper*, 1879. 752 pp. \$4.25. First Am. ed. published in 1872.

Edda, *The Younger*; also called *Snorre's Edda*, or the prose Edda. An English Version, with Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary, and Index, by Rasmus B. Anderson. 8vo. pp. 302. Chicago, *Griggs & Co.* \$2.50.

Morris (I. J.), *Grammar of the Language*. New ed. New York, *Thos. Holman*, 1879. 24mo, 102 pp. \$1.

Nettleship (H.), *Vergil*. New York, *Appleton*, 1880. 106 pp. 60 c.

Shepherd (H. E.), *Hist. of the English Language*. New ed. rev. and corr. New York, *E. J. Hale & Son*, 1880. 227 pp. \$1.50.

Sophocles (E. A.), *Romaic or Modern Greek Grammar*. New series. 12mo, Boston. pp. 196. \$2.25.

BRITISH.

The following books are published in London unless otherwise indicated.

Aristotle. By George Grote. 2d ed., with Additions. 8vo, pp. 676. *Murray*. 18s.

Bigandet (Bp. of Ramathu), *The Life and Legend of Gaudama*. (Oriental Series.) 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 570. *Trübner*. 21s.

Caesar. *De Bello Gallico*. Book I. Edited by J. H. Merryweather and C. C. Tancock. 12mo, pp. 232. *Rivingtons*. 2s.

Caesaris de Bellico Gallico Commentariorum I. II. With English Notes by A. G. Peskett. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, pp. 110. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 2s. 6d.

Catullus. *Select Poems*. Edited by Francis P. Simpson. New ed. revised. 12mo, pp. 246. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Cicero—*The Academics* of. Trans. by James S. Reid. 8vo, pp. 102. *Macmillan*. 5s. 6d.

Cicero. Select Orations. With English Notes by John R. King. 12mo, pp. 154. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Cicero. M. Tullii Ciceronis pro Sexto Roscio Amerino. Edited, after Karl Halm, by E. H. Donkin. 12mo, pp. 160. *Macmillan*. 4s. 6d.

Demosthenes' Oration against the Law of Leptines. Edited by B. W. Bealson. New ed. 12mo, pp. 114. *Bell & Sons*. 3s. 6d.

Dīpavasma (The), An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record. Edited and Translated by Dr. Hermann Oldenberg. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 21s.

Euripides. Alcestis. With Introduction and Notes by C. S. Jerram. 12mo, pp. 110. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Fraser (J.), The Etruscans. *Edinburgh*, 1879. 8vo, pp. 370. 15s.

Gilkes (A. H.), School Lectures on the Electra of Sophocles, and Macbeth. Post 8vo, pp. 156. *Longmans*. 3s. 6d.

Greenfield (W.), Greek Lexicon to the New Testament. 12mo, reduced. *Bagster*. 1s. 6d.

Hellenica: A Collection of Essays on Greek Poetry, Philosophy, History, and Religion. Edited by Evelyn Abbott. 8vo, pp. 516. *Rivingtons*. 16s.

Hodgson (Brian Houghton), Miscellaneous Essays relating to Indian Subjects. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 754. *Trübner*. 28s.

Homer's Iliad. Book I. By the Rev. Edmund Fowle. Post 8vo, pp. 144. *Longmans*. 2s.

Homer's Iliad. Book XXII. By Arthur Sidgwick. Fcap. 8vo., pp. 61. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Homer's Iliad. Book XXII. With Introduction, Notes, etc., by Philip Sandford. 12mo, pp. 60. *Ponsonby* (Dublin). *Simpkin*. 1s. 6d.

Horace. Odes. With English Notes by J. W. Marshall. Books 1, 2, 3, and 4 separately. Cr. 8vo. *Rivingtons*. ea. 1s. 6d.

Lex Salica. The Ten Texts, with the Glosses and the Emendata, synoptically edited by J. H. Hessels. With Notes on the Frankish Words in the Lex Salica by H. Kern. London, 1879. 4to, pp. 680. 50s.

Paley (F. A.), Post-epic; or, Imitative Words in Homer. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 1s. 6d.

Plautus. T. Macci Plauti Captivi. With an Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and Explanatory Notes by E. A. Sonnenschein. 8vo, pp. 126. *Sonnenschein*. 3s. 6d.

Psalterium Tetraglottum: curavit Dr. E. Nestle. 4to, pp. 360. *Williams & Norgate*. 18s.

Raverty (Major H. G.), The Pushto Manual. 12mo, pp. 246. *W. H. Allen*. 5s.

Redhouse (J. W.), Turkish Dictionary: English and Turkish, and Turkish and English. 2d ed. revised and enlarged. 8vo, pp. 880. *Quaritch*. 10s. 6d.

Schömann (E. G.), The Antiquities of Greece. Translated from the German by E. G. Hardy and J. S. Mann. Vol. I. The State. Demy 8vo, pp. 595. *Rivingtons*. 18s.

Stokes (Whitley), Three Middle-Irish Homilies on the Lives of Saints Patrick, Bridget, and Colomba. 8vo, pp. 140. (Calcutta.) *Williams & Norgate*. 5s.

Virgil. P. Vergili Maronis Georgicon: Liber secundus. Edited for the Use of Schools by the Rev. J. H. Skrine. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, pp. 108. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Virgil's Georgics. Book 4. Edited by C. G. Gepp. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 110. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Wyndham (Rev. Francis M.), Latin and Greek as in Rome and Athens; or, Classical Languages and Modern Tongues. 12mo, pp. 88. *Stanford*. 2s. 6d.

Xenophon's Agesilaus. By R. W. Taylor, M. A. Cr. 8vo, pp. 96. *Rivingtons*. 2s. 6d.

FRENCH.

The following books are published in Paris, unless otherwise indicated.

Abou 'L-Walid. Opuscles et traités d'Abou 'L-Walid. Texte arabe avec une trad. française par J. et H. Derenbourg. In-8. (Impr. nationale.) *Baer*. 15 fr.

Adam (Lucien), Du parler des hommes et du parler des femmes dans la langue caraïbe. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 1 fr. 50.

Adam (L.) y V. Henry. Arte y vocabulario de la lengua chiquita. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 15 fr.

Baudat (Émile). Étude sur Denys d'Halicarnasse et la traité de la disposition des mots. In-8. *Vieweg*. 3 fr.

Botkine (L.). La chanson des runes. Texte anglo-saxon. Traduction et notes. In-8. (Le Havre.) *Baer*. 3 fr.

Cougny (Edm.), Extraits des auteurs grecs concernant la géographie et l'histoire des Gaules. Tome II. In-8. *Loones*. 9 fr.

Croiset (Alfr.) Le poésie de Pindare et les lois du lyrisme grec. 1879. 8vo. XVI, 463 pp. 7 fr. 50.

Godefroy (F.) Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du ix^e au xv^e siècle composé d'après le dépouillement de tous les plus importants documents manuscrits ou imprimés qui se trouvent dans les grandes bibliothèques de la France et de l'Europe, et dans les principales archives départementales, municipales, hospitalières ou privées. *Vieweg*. 4to. To be published in 10 vols. @ 10 fascicules, each 5 fr.

Guyard (Stanislas), Manuel de la langue persane vulgaire. In-12. Leide. *Maisonneuve*. Cart., 5 fr.

Harlez (C. de), Etudes éraniennes. I. De l'alphabet avestique et de sa transcription métrique du Gatha vahistoistis et du Fargard XXII. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 2 fr. 50.

Larchey (Lorédan), Dictionnaire des noms, contenant la recherche étymologique des formes anciennes de 20,200 noms relevés sur les annuaires de Paris. In-12. *Imprimerie Berger-Levrault*. 7 fr.

Le Héricher (Edouard), Histoire de deux préfixes à travers le vieux français et les patois. In-8. Auranches. *Maisonneuve*. 2 fr.

Menant (Joachim), Eléments d'épigraphie assyrienne. Manuel de la langue assyrienne. I. Le Syllabaire. II. La Grammaire. III. Choix de lectures. Gr. in-8. Imprimerie nationale. *Maisonneuve*. 18 fr.

Quellien (N.) Annaik. Poésies bretonnes (texte breton-français en regard). Avec une préface de M. Ernest Renan. In-12. *Fischbacher*. 2 fr.

Vaugelas. Remarques sur la langue française. Nouvelle édition par A. Chassang. 2 vol. in-8. *Baudry*. 15 fr.

Violette (le P. L.), Dictionnaire samoan-français-anglais et français-samoan-anglais, précédé d'une grammaire de la langue samoan. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 20 fr.

Zambélios (Sp.), Parlers grecs et romans, leur point de contact préhistorique. Tome 1^{er}. In-4. Turin. *Maisonneuve*. 25 fr.

ITALIAN.

Bonghi (R.), Bibliografia storica di Roma antica. Saggio e proposte. Roma, 1879. 8vo, pp. 178. L. 7, 20.

Buscanio Campo (A.), Studii di filologia italiana. Palermo, 1880. 16mo, pp. 598. L. 6.

DUTCH.

Jansz (P.), Kleine Javaansche spraakkunst. 3e, 8vo. (XXIV er 326 bl.) Samarang, G. C. T. van Dorp en comp. Amsterdam, Scheltema en Holkema. f 6/
Nirayāvaliyāsuttam, een upaṅga der jaina's. Met inleiding, aantekeningen en glossaar van Dr. S. Warren. Roy. 4to. (2, 4, 36 en 24 bl.) Amsterdam, *Johannes Müller*. f 1/80.

GERMAN.

Aristophanis comoediae. Fred. H. M. Blaydes. Pars I. Thesmophoriazusae. gr. 8. (IX, 271 S.) Halle, Buchd. d. Waisenh. n. 5.

At-Tabari, Annales, quos ediderunt J. Barth, Th. Nöldeke, O. Loth, etc. Vol. I. Pars 2. gr. 8. (S. 321—640.) Leiden, *Brill*. (à) n.n. 8.

Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. E. Bernhardt, H. Busch, O. Erdmann, etc. gr. 8. (III, 316 S.) Halle, Buchd. d. Waisenh. n. 8.

Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutsch. Sprache u. Literatur, hrsg. v. Herm. Paul u. Wilh. Braune. 7. Bd. 3 Hfte. gr. 8. (1. Hft. 202 S. m. 1 lith. Karte.) Halle, Niemeyer. n. 15.

Berger (Dr. Hugo), die geographischen Fragmente d. Eratosthenes. gr. 8. (VIII, 393 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 8, 40.

Bibliotheca rabbinica. v. Dr. Aug. Wünsche. 2 Lfg.: Der Midrasch Bereschit Rabba. gr. 8. (96 S.) Leipzig, *O. Schulze*. (à) n. 2.

Binder (Jos. Jul.), Tacitus u. die Geschichte d. römischen Reiches unter Tiberius. gr. 8. (V, 103 S.) Wien, *Lechner's Verl.* n. 4.

Boetticher (Dr. G.), die Wolfram-Literatur seit Lachmann. gr. 8. (VI, 62 S.) Berlin, *Weber*. n. 1. 60.

Brehme (Frdr. Hugo), Linguarum noviciarum laxam temporum significationem iam priscis linguae latinae temporibus in vulgari elocutione perspicere posse. Diss. gr. 4. (52 S.) Göttingen, 1879. *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. baar n. 1. 80.

Briefwechsel d. Frhrn. Karl Hartwig Gregor v. Meusebach m. Jacob u. Wilhelm Grimm. M. Bildniss. gr. 8. (426 S.) Heilbronn. 11. 50.

Buecheler, Interpretatio Tabularum Iguvinarum III et IV. Bonn. University-Programm.

Busolt (Prof. Dr. Geo.), Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte. 1. Thl. gr. 8. (VII, 181 S.) Breslau, *Koebner*. n. 4. 80.

Cihac (A. de), dictionnaire d'étymologie daco-romane. gr. 8. (XXV, 816 S.) Frankfurt a/M. 1879, Lud. St. Goar. baar n. 20.

Conze (Alex.), Pergamon. Aus Monatsber. d. k. Akad. gr. 8. (14 S.) Berlin, Dümmler's Verl. in Comm. baar — 25.

Dönges (Dr. Emil), die Baligantepisode im Rolandsliede. gr. 8. (50 S.) Heilbronn, Henninger in Comm. baar n. 1. 50.

- Dossios (N.), Beiträge zur neugriechischen Wortbildungslehre. Diss. gr. 8. (66 S.) Zürich, 1879. Leipzig, *Matthes*. n. 1. 60.
- Egli (Prof. Dir. Dr. J. J.), etymologisch-geographisches Lexikon. Lex.-8. (IV, 14 u. 644 S.) Leipzig, 1871. *Brandstetter*. n. 12.
- Elias v. Tirhan (Mar.), syrische Grammatik, hrsg. u. übers. v. Frdr. Baethgen. gr. 8. (63 S. u. 47 S. syr. Text.) Leipzig, Hinrichs' Verl. n. 10.
- Euripides, ausgewählte Tragödien. 4. Bdchn.: Hippolytus. Erkl. v. Th. Barthold. gr. 8. (XLVI, 178 S.) Berlin, *Weidmann*. 2. 10. (1., 2. u. 4.: 4. 80.)
- Fellner (Dr. Thomas), zur Geschichte der attischen Finanzverwaltung im 5. u. 4. Jahrh. Lex.-8. (64 S.) Wien, 1879, Gerold's Sohn in Comm. n.n. — 90.
- Frankfurter (Osk.), üb. die epenthese v. j [i] & [v] im griechischen. Diss. gr. 8. (48 S.) Göttingen, 1879. *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. baar n. 1.
- Gaedicke (Dr. Carl), der Accusativ im Veda dargestellt. gr. 8. (VI, 290 S.) Breslau, *Koebner*. n. 7. 20.
- Goebel (Prov.-Schulr. Dr. Ant.), Lexilogus zu Homer u. den Homeriden. 2. Bd. gr. 8. (X, 677 S.) Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 17. (1. u. 2.: n. 33.—).
- Grein (Prof. Dr. C. W. M.), kurzgefasste angelsächsische Grammatik. gr. 8. (IV, 92 S.) Kassel, *Wigand*. n. 2.
- Heiberg (Dr. J. L.), philologische Studien zu griechischen Mathematikern. I—II. gr. 8. (45 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 1. 20.
- Hemacandra's Grammatik der Prākritsprachen, hrsg. v. Rich. Pischel. 2. Thl. gr. 8. (VII, 246 S.) Halle, Buchh. d. Waisenh. (à) n. 8.
- Hense (Otto), Studien zu Sophokles. gr. 8. (VIII, 322 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 8.
- Hernsheim (Frz.), Beitrag zur Sprache der Marshall-Inseln. 8. (101 S.) Leipzig, *Thiel*. n. 2.
- Hertz (Mart.), analecta ad carminum Horatianorum historiam. IV. gr. 4. (27 S.) Breslau, *Koebner*. baar — 75.
- Hillebrandt (Alfr.), das altindische Neu- u. Vollmondsopfer. gr. 8. (XVII, 199 S.) Jena, *Fischer*. n. 7.
- Jahrbücher f. classische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Alfr. Fleckeisen. II. Suppl.-Bd. 1. Hft. gr. 8. (399 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 8.
- Katalog der Bibliothek der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. I. Druckschriften u. Aehnliches. gr. 8. (XIV, 215 S.) Leipzig, Brockhaus' Sort. in Comm. n. 6.
- Keil (Henr.), et Gust. Jürgens, observationes in Caesium Bassum et Atilium Fortunatianum. gr. 4. (10 S.) Halle, *Hendel*. n. n. — 25.
- Kelle (Prof. Dr. Joh.), Glossar zu Otfrieds Evangelienbuch. 2. u. 3. Hft. gr. 8. (S. 97—272.) Regensburg, *Manz*. (à) n. 2. 80.
- Keller (Otto), Epilegomena zu Horaz. 2. Thl. gr. 8. (S. 291—592.) Leipzig, *Teubner*.
- Keller (Wilh.), russisches Sprachbuch. Ein Versuch in genet. Methode. III. Deklination u. Konjugation. II. 8. (II, 52 S.) Riga, 1879. *Kymmell*. cart. n. 2. 40 (1—4.: n. 4. 95.
- Koerner (Otto), die homerische Thierwelt. gr. 8. (90 S.) Berlin, Nicolai's Verl. n. 1. 50.
- Kottenkamp (Johs.), zur Kritik u. Erklärung d. Tristan Gottfrieds v. Strassburg. Diss. gr. 8. (36 S.) Göttingen, 1879. *Vandenh. & Rup.* baar n. 1.

Krall (Dr. Jac.), die Composition u. die Schicksale d. Manethonischen Geschichtswerkes. Lex.-8. (106 S.) Wien, 1879. Gerold's Sohn in Comm. n. 1. 80.

Kvičala (Joh.), Studien zu Euripides. 2. Thl. (Alkestis, Ion, Hekabe.) Imp.-4 (94 S.) Wien, 1879. Gerold's Sohn in Comm. n. 4. 40 (1. u. 2.: n. 7.

Lauth (Dr. Fr. Jos.), Siphthas u. Amenmeses. (Aus: Abhandlgn. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss.) gr. 4. (67 S.) München, 1879. Franz in Comm. baar n. n. 1.

Leo (Willibald), die gesammte Literatur Walther's v. der Vogelweide. 8. (XI, 99 S.) Wien, *Gottlieb*. n. 2.

Liber Psalmorum. S. Baer. Praefatus est ed. Franc. Delitzsch. gr. 8. (XII, 160 S.) Leipzig, *B. Tauchnitz*. 1. 50; Velinpap. 1. 80.

Meinhold (Paul), de rebus Salaminiis. gr. 8. (46 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 1. 60.

Miklosich (Dr. Frz.), üb. die Mundarten u. die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europa's. IX. Imp.-8. (52 S.) Wien, 1879. Gerold's Sohn in Comm. n. 2. 40 (I—IX.: n. 29. 80).

Μεγαλὴ (Ἰωάννης), Μακεδονικὰ ἦτοι νεώτερα ἑλληνικὰ ἤδη ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ ἐν σχέσει πρὸς τὰ ἀρχαῖα. gr. 8. (41 S.) Göttingen, *Vandenh. & Rup.* baar n. 1.

Mohr (Max), die Quellen d. Plutarchischen u. Nepotischen Themistokles. (67 S.) Berlin, 1879. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. baar n. 1. 80.

Dettingen, (Alex. v.), Goethe's Faust. 1. u. 2. Thl. Text u. Erläuterg. in Vorlesgn. 1. Thl. gr. 8. (XVI, 306 S.) Erlangen, *Deichert*. n. 5.

Patrum, sanctorum, opuscula selecta, ed. Prof Dr. H. Hurter, S. J. XL. 16. Innsbruck, 1879. *Wagner*. 1. 20 (I—XL.: 39. 74). Inhalt: S. Gregorii Nazianzeni, oratio apologetica de fuga sua, et S. Joan. Chrysostomi, archiepiscopi Cp., de sacerdotio libri VI. (292 S.)

Paucker (C. v.), die lateinischen Deminutive auf einfaches -ulus, -ula, -ulum. gr. 8. (31 S.) Mitau, 1876. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 1. 60.

Platonis Euthydemus, Protagoras. Ed. Mart. Schanz. Ed. ster. gr. 8. (90 S.) Leipzig, *B. Tauchnitz*. — 45.

Platonis opera, quae ferunter omnia. Ed. Mart. Schanz. Vol. VII. Euthydemus, Protagoras. gr. 8. (XVI, 119 S.) Leipzig, *B. Tauchnitz*. n. 4. 50.

Plauti (T. Maccii), comoediae. Rec. et enarravit Joa. Ludov. Ussing. Vol. III. pars 2, Epidicum, Mostellariam, Menaechmos continens. gr. 8. (VIII, 448 S.) Havniae. Leipzig, *T. O. Weigel*. n. n. 11. 25.

Propertii (Sex.), elegiarum libri IV. Rec. Aemilius Baehrens. gr. 8. (LIV, 198 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*.

Protodicos (Joa.), de aedibus homericis. Diss. gr. 8. (74 S. m. 1 Steintaf.) Leipzig, 1877. *Matthes*. n. 1. 20.

Ramorinus (Dr. Felix), in Platonis Protagoram explanationes. gr. 8. (65 S.) Turin, *Loescher*. n. 1. 60.

Satura philologa Hermanno Sauppio obtulit amicorum conlegarum decas. gr. 8. (V, 180 S.) Berlin, 1879. *Weidmann*. n. 8.

Sauppe (Herm.), quaestiones Lucretianae. 4. (14 S.) Göttingen, Dieterich's Verl. baar n.—80.

Schmidt (Prof. Mor.), miscellaneorum philologicorum particula IV. gr. 4. (17 S.) Jena, *E. Frommann*. baar n. — 50 (I—4.: n. 2. 70).

Schmidt (Woldemar), textes hiéroglyphiques inscrits sur pierre, tirés du musée

de Copenhagen, traduits. gr. 4. (20 S.) Kopenhagen, 1879, *Høst & Sohn*. baar n. 3.

Schnorf (Kaspar), der mythische Hintergrund im Gudrunlied u. in der Odyssee. Inaugural-Dissertation. gr. 8. (56 S.) Zürich, 1879, *Schulthess* n. 1. 60.

Senecae epistulas aliquot, ex Bambergensi et Argentoratensi codicibus ed. Franc. Buechelér. gr. 8. (VIII, 66 S. m. 2 autogr. Taf.) Bonn. Trier, *Lints*. n. 1.

Shakspeare (Will.), works. Ed. with critical notes and introductory notices by Prof. Dr. W. Wagner. IV, VIII and IX. 8. Hamburg, *Gräbner*. (à) n. — 50; cart. (à) n. — 60. Inhalt: IV. Measure for Measure. (V, 87 S.) VIII. A Midsummer-night's Dream. (V, 68 S.) IX. The Merchant of Venice. (V, 83 S.)

Sieglin (Dr. Wilh.), die Fragmente d. L. Coelius Antipater. gr. 8. (92 S.) Leipzig, 1879, *Teubner*. n. 2.

Stark (Prof. Dr. Carl. Bernh.), Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst. I. Abth. A. u. d. T.: Systematik u. Geschichte der Archäologie der Kunst. 2. (Schluss-)Lfg. gr. 8. (VIII, u. S. 257—400.) Leipzig, *Engelmann*. n. 3. 75 (cpl.: n. 10. 50).

Stenzler (Adf. Frdr.), Elementarbuch der Sanskrit-Sprache. Grammatik, Text, Wörterbuch. 4. verb. Aufl. gr. 8. (IV, 127 S.) Breslau, *Köhler*. n. 4.

Studien. romanische, hrsg. v. Ed. Boehmer. 14 Hft. (4. Bd. 2. Hft.) gr. 8. (S. 197—350.) Bonn, 1879, *Weber*. n. 4.

Syri, Publilii, Mimi sententiae. Rec. Guil. Meyer. gr. 8. (78 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 2. 40.

Tacitus, Agricola. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Prof. Ign. Prammer. 8. (XVI, 87 S.) Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. n. 1.

Tacitus' Geschichte der Kaiser Claudius u. Nero. (Annalen, Buch XI—XVI.) Uebers. u. erklärt v. Adf. Stahr. gr. 8. (328 S.) Berlin, *Guttenlag*. n. 6. (Annalen I—VI, XI—XVI, in 1 Bd.: n. 10.)

Theognidis elegiae. Secundis curis recognovit Chrph. Ziegler. gr. 8. (VIII, 79 S.) Tübingen, *Laupp*. n. 2. 40.

Theognidis reliquiae. Ed. Dr. Jac. Sitzler. gr. 8. (III, 172 S.) Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. n. 4. 80.

Thucydides, *συγγραφή*. Praesertim in usum scholarum recognovit et brevi annotatione instruxit Henr. van Herwerden. Vol. III, continens lib. IV et V. 8. (VIII, 211 S.) Trajecti ad Rhenum. Leipzig, *T. O. Weigel* in Comm. n. 2. 40 (I—III.: n. 6.)

Thumser (Vict.), de civium Atheniensium muneribus eorumque immunitate. gr. 8. (151 S.) Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. n. 4.

Tudeer (Dr. O. E.), de dialectorum graecarum digammo testimonia inscriptionum collegit et examinavit. gr. 8. (IV, 144 S.) Helsingforsiae. Leipzig, *Simmel & Co.* baar n. 3.

Virchow (Rud.), Beiträge zur Landeskunde der Troas. Mit. 2. (lith. u. 1 chromolith.) Taf. gr. 4. (190 S.) Berlin, *Dümmeler's Verl.* in Comm. cart. n. 22.

Vollertsen (Geo.), quaestionum Catonianarum capita II. Diss. gr. 4. (49 S. m. 1 Steintaf.) Kiel (v. Maack). n. 2. 50.

Walthers v. der Vogelweide Gedichte. Auswahl. Hrsg. u. m. Anmerkgn. u. e. Glossar versehen v. Bernh. Schulz. 2 Aufl. 8. (XVI, 129 S.) Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1. 20.

Werke, die, der Troubadours, in provenzal. Sprache. Hrsg. v. Dr. C. A. F. Mahn. 3. Bd. 2. Lfg. gr. 8. (S. 65—128.) Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* baar (à) n. 1. 50 (I—III. 2. u. IV.: n. 18).

Wolff (Doc. Dr. Herm.), Logik u. Sprachphilosophie. gr. 8. (XII, 414 S.) Berlin, *Denicke*. n. 10.

Wolzogen (Hans v.), Geschichte u. Gesetze der deutschen Rechtschreibung. 8. (47 S.) Leipzig, *Schloemp*. n. 1.

Wrobel (Prof. Dr. Joh.), üb. e. neue Hesiodhandschrift. Lex.-8. (4 S.) Wien, *Gerold's Sohn* in Comm. n.n. — 30.

Wüstenfeld (F.), die Geographie u. Verwaltung v. Aegypten, nach dem Arab. d. Abul'-Abbās. In 2 Abthlgn. gr. 4. (225 S.) Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 9.

C. Zangemeister et G. Wattenbach, exempla codicum latinorum literis maiusculis scriptorum. Supplementum, continens tab. (photolithogr.) LI—LXII. Fol. (8 S. Text.) Heidelberg, 1879, *Koester*. baar n.n. 25 (Hauptwerk u. Suppl.: n.n. 85).

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Views on the Study of Language, by Prof. J. S. Blackwell, Professor of the Semitic Language and Literature in the University of Missouri. s. l. cl. t.

Odes of Horace in English Verse, by Caskie Harrison. Boston, *Ginn & Heath*, 1877.

Revue Egyptologique publiée sous la direction de MM. H. Brugsch, F. Chabas, Eug. Revillont. Première année. No. 1. 1880. Paris: E. Leroux. New York, *B. Westermann & Co.*

Fonetic Ticher. Feb., 1880. St. Luis.

Introduction to the Study of Sign Language among the North American Indians, etc. By Prof. Garrick Mallery, Bvt. Lt. Col. U. S. Army. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology. 1880.

The editor of the American Journal of Philology takes this, the first opportunity after his return from Europe, of thanking Professor Charles D. Morris publicly for his valuable aid in seeing the second number of the Journal through the press, and for his generous assumption of the entire work of editing the present issue. Like thanks are due to Dr. Wm. Hand Browne, who has conducted the business of the office during the absence of the editor far better than his inexperienced principal could have done. The editor has also great pleasure in announcing that he has been so fortunate as to secure the help of several English scholars of high attainments and wide reputation, and that papers are in preparation for ensuing numbers of the Journal by such men as Campbell, Robinson Ellis, Mayor, Nettleship.